THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIII OCTOBER, 1941 No. 256

EDITORIAL

THE articles in the September number of *Blackfriars*[1] are all concerned with the subject of reunion. The first and most important is by Fr Victor White, O.P., on "Membership of the Church". He takes as his starting-point the question which Fr Mascall, writing in THEOLOGY (March, 1941, p. 138), affirmed to be embarrassing to Roman Catholics—namely, whether it is baptism or submission to the Pope that makes a man a Catholic. Fr White has no difficulty in showing that similar questions as to what constitutes membership of the Church could be propounded to Anglicans, and that they would be similarly embarrassing. It is only by a popular simplification that black-and-white, "either-or" questions can be asked and answered about who are and who are not Christians. There is, of course, a widespread impression[2] that Roman Catholic theology has got all such matters cut and dried, and that there at all events you can be sure of knowing exactly where you stand and indeed where everyone else stands. Many Anglicans have supposed this to be the great attraction of Rome. No doubt the idea is often exploited in controversy on the one side and on the other, but Fr White is far too candid to allow it to rest.

We should be rid of the idea that the Church is a highly exclusive club in the sense that one is either wholly inside it or wholly outside it. Certainly the Church is visible, and visible by reason of the visibility of her members and her organization. But the edges are very blurred.[3]

[1] Blackwell, 1s. monthly.

[2] It seems to us a blemish on Dr Whale's admirable lectures on *Christian Doctrine* that he is under this impression; see, *e.g.*, p. 132.

[3] With these words may be compared what Dr N. P. Williams wrote in *Northern Catholicism* (p. 215): "The city of God upon earth would seem to have been (and therefore to be always potentially capable of being) surrounded by a *pomœrium*, or a fringe of suburbs, which are distinguishable from the city itself and yet not altogether disjoined from it—it may even be said, in some sense one with it."

He shows that for Roman Catholics " membership of the Church " is not a univocal concept, but has several meanings. Dr Whale speaks of " the unyielding Latin dictum that there is no salvation outside the Church,"[1] but he will find that, as interpreted by Fr White, it yields a great deal. Much harm is done by encouraging the notion that the Church of Rome is committed to a brutally clear and exclusive doctrine of the Church; but one reason why it exists may be inferred from the fact that the generous temper and discriminating thought of *Blackfriars* strike non-Roman readers, and perhaps Roman readers too, as exceptional and not usual.

I think it must be admitted (writes Fr White) that the Catholic doctrine and theology of membership of the Church is not at all so familiar among us as it ought to be.

We can certainly say the same, and we are grateful for the light which this article throws on the subject.

* * * * *

Another article in the same number of *Blackfriars* is on " Collaboration and Reunion " by Fr Henry St John, O.P. He says it is important not to confuse the growing collaboration between Christians in social action, of which there has been a noteworthy advance during the past year and which is comparatively straightforward, with progress towards reunion. He warmly approves endeavours in both directions, but points out that whereas collaboration with a view to social reconstruction is based on a minimum Christianity which all Christians can accept, progress towards reunion means progress towards the acceptance by all Christians of a maximum Christianity. The approach to the latter must be theological: " It must be primarily the work of theologians, and it must go to the theological and psychological roots of the differences that divide us." To this end Fr St John advocates the formation of small groups of theologians—" Catholic, Anglican and Free Church—few in number to begin with, but gradually increasing on the cell system." Each group should be kept small so that a friendly atmosphere and complete frankness and freedom should be maintained. The two conditions incumbent on every member should be (1) " a generous realization of the entire sincerity of each of his fellow members " and (2) " an intense desire to enter into and understand their point of

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

view and their beliefs." We cordially welcome this proposal; if it seems to lack novelty, we would ask how many such groups are actually in existence?

* * * * *

Those who consider the meaning of membership of the Church will have to give more attention than has been customary to the theology of baptism. It was acknowledgment of the validity of heretical baptism which first made it apparent that the edges of the Church are blurred. Disagreements about the nature of the Church may often be traced to confusions of thought about baptism. In England the demand is becoming more insistent that something shall be done about the indiscriminate baptism of infants; but there is a prior demand to be made—*viz.*, that a great deal more thought shall be given to the theology of baptism. As it is, if attempts are made to impose a new discipline in regard to baptismal practice, they are likely to be frustrated by an incompetence to provide any better justification for what is proposed than for what at present has to be endured. Moreover, baptism, as Dr Richards said in our last number, cannot profitably be considered apart from confirmation. An article in the *Anglican Theological Review* (July, 1941)[1] deals with the same subject, but with different results. The writer, like Dr Richards, holds that confirmation mediates the gift of the Holy Spirit, but he maintains that it therefore belongs integrally to the rite of baptism, from which it ought never to have been separated. In practice the rite of confirmation has come to be used for other purposes, notably the acceptance of their baptismal responsibilities by those who have come to years of discretion and the reception of Christians from non-episcopal denominations into the Anglican communion. He suggests that separate offices should be provided for these purposes, and that both should be distinguished from confirmation, which should be reunited with baptism.[2]

[1] Published at 600, Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois, U.S.A. $1.00.

[2] "If bishops in the past could grant the power of baptizing and celebrating the Eucharist to priests, surely they can now delegate that of Confirmation."

The Genius of Anglicanism[1]

If I had to choose a verse from the Bible which seemed best to supply the motto of Anglicanism, I should have no hesitation in choosing Matthew xiii, 52: "Every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." There are some Christian communions in which tradition exercises a dictatorship which deprives them of flexibility and renders them unaccommodating to any new idea, even when the new idea is true. Romanism has never shown a hospitable disposition towards new knowledge. Again, there are other Christian bodies which attach to tradition but a very secondary importance; they disclaim all considerations of pedigree, and in consequence they lack stability and sit loosely to old ideas, even when those old ideas are good. Some forms of Protestantism seem to be recurrently liable to outbreaks of Unitarian measles. But it is the peculiar characteristic of Anglicanism to seek to bring out of its treasure things new and old—the new standing on the shoulders of the old, the old affording precedent for the guidance of the new—and both fusing together into a body of truth and practice which has both the virtues of gratitude to the past and of attentiveness to present and future. Its watchword is neither exclusively Reverence for Antiquity nor exclusively Readiness for Novelty. But it strives to combine both—to reverence tradition yet not so as to be blind to what is good in novelty, to be ready for novelty but not so as to be unfaithful to what is sound in its traditional heritage. Its watchword in short is Development—its ruling passion is for Truth—its governing conviction is that God fulfils Himself in many ways and that the Holy Spirit has still new avenues of truth down which to lead us.

The attempt has, of course, its own peculiar difficulties. It is never easy to be sure when a tradition has ceased to be valuable, and has become merely the wielder of a dead hand, nor to be sure whether a novelty is a mere ephemeral phase or whether it has the marks of a true development. It is as in a piece of music: an accidental may be a mere passing note which makes its impression only for the

[1] Presidential Address to the Bradford Diocesan Conference, July 9, 1941.

moment, the tune going on after it in the same key; or it may introduce a real change of key, which modifies the whole structure of the tune. So with any novelty, in thought, in religion, in custom; it is not always obvious at once what difference it has made or whether it has been a mere temporary variation. It may be a legitimate child of the old truth, carrying on, though in a new form, the tradition from which it springs. Or it may be a cuckoo in the nest, destined to upset the true nestlings and then to fly away on its solitary business. It is not wise to be hastily dogmatic as to what is a tradition of fundamental importance or a novelty of unimpeachable promise. I can cite as instances the remarkable Liturgical Movement which is at work in certain parts of the Roman Church—and the parallel tendency in the English Church to institute a parish Eucharist on Sunday mornings. These are novelties, the staying power of which cannot now be predicted. But their obvious purpose is to reunite the ideas of communion and sacrifice, which had become separated by the strong emphasis laid in Roman and high Anglican circles on the practice of a non-communicant Mass as the chief Sunday service.

The Anglican attempt to pay regard to both new and old undoubtedly makes our course seem at times vacillating, while it exposes us to the sneers of the heady partisan, whether of one or of the other, and to the more serious accusation of compromise from those who do not realize the greatness of the experiment which Anglicanism is making, nor the difficulties which must beset such an experiment by fallible men. Nor would any but the most biased Anglican declare that we have never made a mistake, that we have never trimmed our sails to what proved to be but a passing breeze of intellectual fashion, or held on our course in defiance of real shifts in the wind of truth.

The Deistic tendency of English thought in the eighteenth century and its defective sacramentalism in the beginning of the nineteenth both mark periods when the Church seemed ready to pay undue deference to what was but a passing breeze of dull rationalism; while the horror with which many regarded the geological discoveries of the mid-nineteenth century, the panic into which they were thrown by the speculations of Darwin and the theory of Evolution, the violent reassertion of biblical Fundamentalism against the loosening of Christian foundations which was expected

to follow on the acceptance of modern scientific ideas, are instances of the Church's ability to bring in conservative prejudice to hinder the progress of new truth. It took time before we learnt that Deism and Rationalism were scientifically inadequate to explain the facts of life and knowledge, or that modern science made no breach in the basis of Christianity but only in superfluous outworks which men had mistaken for its basis. Deism is now dead; in these days heresy is far more likely to be pantheistic. But the conflict between Rationalism and Sacramentalism still continues; and one of the main practical problems of the Anglican parson still arises from the unreadiness of the ordinary Englishman to believe in or to understand the meaning of sacramental grace. So again the recent discoveries of archæology have been used by some to discredit the methods of biblical criticism, and a new obscurantist Fundamentalism is at present very vociferous among both elderly Evangelicals and youthful Anglo-Catholics.

But in spite of mistakes which we have committed, and criticisms which we may have deserved, Anglicanism still holds to the program which it has pursued all through its history, and, so far as we can tell, its ideal is as much now to be the *via media* between old and new as it was when Cranmer or Laud ruled at Canterbury or when Newman chose the phrase as his description of the Anglican way.

For this is in fact the reality as to the mediating position which we occupy. Superficially it looks as if we were a half-way house between Protestantism and Catholicism—as if we were Catholic, but less so than Rome, Protestant, but not so whole-heartedly as some of the Protestant sects. We are often so represented, as a Protestantism which is incidentally episcopalian, or as a Catholicism which by an unfortunate accident is not papal. But actually the issue is not as to our respective views on ecclesiastical jurisdiction or theories of Orders, but as to our respective attitudes to old and new in the story of human knowledge of, and human relation to, God. The fundamental characteristic of Anglicanism is not so much that it has bishops, but does not have the Pope, as that it tries to look both backward and forward; that it acknowledges its debt to the past while it recognizes its responsibility to the present; that it knows that the past has much to teach it; and that only on condition of not forgetting the lessons of the past can it

do its duty properly in teaching the future. We live for posterity, but we live by antiquity.

Thus on the one hand we still hold to the Catholic essentials. These are, broadly, three in number.

First, the conviction of the revelation of God given in Jesus Christ; that the life of Christ on earth was the Incarnation of the Son of God and not a mere display of human excellence; that he who has seen Christ has seen the Father; that, however we phrase it, in Christ we see the divine way shown for man to walk, the divine truth revealed for man to accept, the divine life manifested for man to receive—of this Anglicanism is as convinced as were those who framed the Creeds which we still repeat as our standard of faith. Modernism, in any technical sense, has no real future in the Church of England. It is intrinsically a child of its age. It dates; and its vogue is already past. In England no modernism which questions the fundamental Catholic convictions has any chance of acceptance. We are deeply distrustful of mere humanism; we do not believe that you can properly understand the nature and destiny of man except as you see him in his relation to God; and we are sure that God is needed by man both to explain life and to enable it to attain its full possibilities.

Secondly, that in the Church of Christ is preserved the living power of the Holy Spirit, that in the ordered life of sacramental churchmanship the grace of a real and living God is imparted to man, that God works through the fellowship of the Church, and that the life of membership is the way of salvation for those who follow faithfully in it—this too is still a ruling conviction of Anglicanism. That God can meet man in many ways we must gladly admit; but in the Church is His covenanted road of access to the heart of His people.

We shrink as a Church from any mere religious individualism. Quakerism and Eremitism are alike foreign to our spiritual habit. We believe that man's personality requires society for its education and sphere of expression. We do not believe that the soul alone with God has yet found the fullness of God nor the fullness of its own potentiality. If God is a Father, no man can really find God who does not find the brotherhood over which God presides.

And, thirdly, that this continuity of internal grace in the Church is canalized and protected by a continuity of ex-

ternal structure; that the apostolic Faith is best preserved, and the apostolic Sacraments are best safeguarded, within the framework of the apostolic ministry; that continuity of structure is the best guarantee for continuity of life; this too is still as strong a conviction in modern Anglicanism as it was in that of the great Caroline divines, who declared that this form of ministry was the rightful heir to the function and charge exercised by the first apostles of the Lord Himself. We may be more or less ready to be conciliatory to those who have renounced this form; but none of us would doubt as to its apostolic character or question its validity as the historic form of ministry handed down to us from the earliest Church. There are amongst us many varieties in the emphasis on the doctrine of apostolic succession and in the interpretation of its meaning. But the Church of England as a body clings, often subconsciously and inarticulately, but none the less firmly, to the view that the continuity of priestly ministry gives to sacramental ministrations that validity which comes from their pedigree in apostolic practice.

We believe in the reality of divine grace. Of course none of us believes enough in it or uses it enough; and no doubt we have our controversies as to the methods by which it works. But the fact that it does work and that through the channels of the sacramental ordinances of the historic Church that grace reaches us, is a fact to the certainty of which we hold unflinchingly.

Herein, then, are points of general acceptance in the Anglican communion; I claim that they are all characteristic and entirely Catholic. Judged by them, our claim to be a branch of the Catholic Church is unimpeachable by any save one who accepts the modern form of the Roman claim, which makes Catholic and papal synonymous.

So far, then, we look back to the Rock whence we are hewn and seek neither to disown our pedigree nor to treat it lightly. We wish to dissever ourselves from the Apostolic Church neither by mutilation of the essentials of faith and order which it laid down nor by adding to them either new doctrines or new grades of hierarchy as of equal necessity or obligation with those which the Catholic Church of the first centuries received.

In these respects antiquity is our guide. That which the early Church established as essential, the apostolic Faith, the apostolic sacraments as the appointed channels of

grace, and the apostolic ministry as the framework for the safeguarding of that continuous grace, are the essentials to which we adhere and for which we demand recognition.

On the other hand we remember that we are living in modern and not in ancient times—that new truths have come to light, new problems have arisen or old ones have taken on a fresh aspect, that new circumstances have supervened—and that it is the Church's business, if it would bring out of its treasure things new as well as old, to be docile to the leading of the Holy Spirit in His effort to use us in these latter days as He used our forefathers in their time. Even a good custom can corrupt the world, if it be persisted in when the times have so altered as to rob it of its applicability. Christianity must be adaptable to all the successive phases of human development; adaptable to such a degree as to be able to serve and inspire the new times in which we live, as it served and inspired the old times in which it took its shape. Such has in all ages been the call of God to His servants in human history; and the call in the present time is that we should recognize the new duties which it lays on us, the new emphases which it necessitates, in order to make our witness to the eternal truth of Christ tell in the conditions of our own age.

This means no flighty modernism, ready to jettison the articles of the Christian Faith in order to suit the successive fashions of modern teaching. The *dernier cri* of intellectual modishness must not be mistaken for the last word of truth. It means rather a continual re-presentation of the spiritual truths which are the essence of the Christian gospel, in such guise and under such forms as will bring its message home to the minds whom modern thinking might otherwise bemuse. It means learning to emphasize and expound the old facts—of the reality of God, of man's place as the child of God, of Christ as the Word of God, and the Church as the focus of His Spirit—in such wise as to commend them to the mind of the present generation. For such work the guiding inspiration is not an intellectual curiosity for new things but a pastoral desire to make truth come home to the souls of modern men and women. And the conviction which governs us is that Truth is always justified of her faithful disciples. Truth is one. But it has not only many facets but many ways of presentation. Any teacher knows the need for constant restatement in order to ensure that the truth which he knows shall be fairly set out so as

to get over unperverted to those to whom he is speaking. The Church is a teaching Church. Its teaching is not merely to recite facts and doctrines, to be accepted by unreflecting docility, but to recite them in such a way as to commend them to the intelligence and to bring them home to the conscience of God's children in age after age. Thus we lay no embargo on the search for truth in any direction. We offer our veriest fundamentals for examination at the bar of Reason, secure that they will stand the test, however searchingly it may be applied. We hold our doctrines firmly. But we hold them in no doctrinaire spirit. We do not tell the world to accept our doctrines because they are ours, but because they are true. And we believe that, when properly examined, appraised and understood, no new truth can shake or overturn the foundations on which our Faith rests.

Such is, as I read it, the character of that fascinating thing called Anglicanism. It is Catholic, for it holds the Catholic essentials; it is Protestant, because it rejects the papal innovations in faith and order. It is traditional, for it looks back to the past for the body of its creed, for the great facts of the Christian revelation on which it is based, and to the great march of the Church's history, from which it draws its precedents; and it is modern, for it seeks ever to make this creed and these facts tell with force in the minds of the modern age.

At times it seems a bewildering attempt to conflate incompatibles. The attempt to look both before and after may result in a squint. At times even the most devoted child of Anglicanism may confess to a feeling of irritation at its paradoxes and apparent inconsistencies. A witty Anglo-Catholic, now a convert to Rome, once said that in considering the Church of England he felt like the man who, when looking at a fruit tart in early summer said: "Gooseberry, I hope; rhubarb, I fear; apple, I think." So of the Church of England he would say: "Catholic, I hope; Protestant, I fear; High Church, I think." Like many other witticisms, it is quite superficial and does not touch any of the deeper meanings at issue. Or we often hear sneers at the capacity of the Church of England to house three religions under one roof; in which case, to continue Father Knox's metaphor, it would, I suppose, be a fruit salad. Why, asks the man who wants everything made plain sailing for him, why not have everything cut

and dried as Romanism does? Or why not be ready to accept all novelty and to treat antiquity with cavalier neglect, as seems to be done by some forms of Protestantism? Must we for ever appear to speak with two voices and be exposed to flouting on either side for doing so? Must we for ever try to fuse the elements of old and new, when the fusion is so hard to accomplish and the proper relation between the two is so difficult to discern and to maintain? We cannot help being conscious of the difficulty of justifying our position. The way of doctrinaire rigidity is easier, though not generally popular. The way of modernist laxity is easier and wins popularity with the unthinking. On the one hand is the danger of evaporating fundamental truths in the traditional deposit. On the other hand is the danger of spiritually fossilizing. And there is always headstrong Modernism pulling us in one direction and stiff Reactionism pulling us in the other. Are we for ever to be the prey of these contending influences? Why not submit to one or to the other and have done with the uncertainties and perplexities of our middle way?

But I remember the wise words of the great Hooker, who warned us that things which seem plain may be more plain than true. I believe that in the path which Anglicanism pursues she is acting like a wise scribe, instructed unto the kingdom of heaven. She tries to balance old and new, authority and freedom, tradition and novelty; and, though the task is infinitely difficult, I believe none the less that it is the peculiar task which God has designed us to do and that to shirk it will be to be unfaithful to our special commission from God. We stand in Christendom for a non-papal Catholicism—for the belief that the necessary antithesis of Protestantism is not Catholicism but Papalism—that Protestantism need not be merely individualistic, modernist, and humanist, but that the wisest Protestantism is that which, while rejecting the claim of the Papacy to be the only fount of grace, of truth, and of authority, yet knows how to venerate the tradition which has been in all ages the spinal column of the Church's system. In standing for this we are making to the Christian religion a contribution which no other Christian communion in the world tries to make or can make so effectively. We are engaged on a bigger experiment for the building of the City of God than any other has dared to tackle. We

are trying as no other Christian body is trying to build a city which shall not be sectional but four-square.

At the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order we have been universally recognized as the Bridge-Church, as the one Church which in any eventual reunion of Christendom must hold the central position, because in the days of Christian disunion it has always held the middle way. In this recognition we have the reward for all that we have had to bear—in misunderstandings and sneers from without or disloyalty from within—for our fidelity to our position. " To be the Bridge-Church ": it is a proud heritage which we owe to the wisdom and vision of our forefathers. We must see to it that we are not unworthy to be their inheritors. Anglicanism is one of the great species of the Christian genus—one of the great types of Catholic Church order. It suffers from weaknesses, some of which may be inherent in its system, but most of which are due to the immense demands which it makes on its adherents. It asks for an educated clergy and an intelligent laity. It offers us freedom and trusts us not to misuse it for licence, it calls us to obedience but does not ask that this obedience be servile. It aims at being progressive without being iconoclastic, at revering tradition without becoming obscurantist. It is worthy of the respect of all for the ideal which it pursues, of the sympathy of its critics for the difficulties which that pursuit entails, of the loyalty and pride of its children for the perseverance with which it holds fast to its profession.

In the present time, I believe that the immediate challenge of the spiritual situation calls us in three special directions to a fresh emphasis on our principles and to a fresh realization of our duty.

In the first place the times call us to a great effort of reaffirmation of our dogmatic basis. I agree with those who say that, so far from being too theological and dogmatic, we have taken fright at theology and have been content to be moralistic and pietistic, with the result that we have ceased to generate Christian energy as we should, because we have been timid in stating the Christian convictions which alone can generate that energy.

Secondly, we are called to use a great plainness in declaring the Christian moral standard, ideal, and law. We have too easily allowed Christian morals to be watered down until they either become little more than the accepted

conventions of gentlemanly behaviour, or else they figure as the respectability of a law-abiding Englishman. The austere idealism of our Lord's ethical principles is something very different from, and a great deal more severe than, the easy decency and good nature which often passes muster as Christian morality. True love is never easy-going.

Lastly, we are called to a social passion which will fire the Church to resume the prophetic rôle in relation to society, to industry, and to politics, which as an organization it has too long laid aside. We have for too long misused our Catechism and tried to induce individuals to walk worthy of their vocation in the state of life to which they were called. It is time that we resumed the task, which the Christian Church in many past centuries fulfilled, of telling the world wherein this very state of life handicapped unfairly men from either being likely to hear the call or being able to respond to it.

None of these three activities will make us popular either with the great easy-going British public or with our own predominantly conservative laity. If we embark on them, we may be prepared for the opposition or the resignation of many of our churchwardens and church councillors. But it may be that the true genius of Anglicanism will never have a chance of showing its full quality until the Church of England has begun so to behave that men shall find it impossible to treat it with amiable indifference or friendly contempt. When it acts and speaks so significantly as to make itself violently disliked, it may be on the way to arousing in its most genuine and spiritually-minded children a passion of loyalty such as is not at present frequently given to it. If it takes risks, and eschews Safety First, for the sake of serving Christ more whole-heartedly, it may reach the proud position that men shall revile it and speak all manner of evil against it, falsely, for His sake; and so its blessing at His hands will be sure.

ALFRED BRADFORD.

The Theological Colleges and the Future

Amid the widespread discussion of the training of the clergy a great deal of criticism is directed against the theological colleges. It is the purpose of this article to try to clarify some of the problems which are involved and to plead for a close attention to certain values (including intellectual ones) wherein the theological colleges have had a big significance.

The greater number of the colleges have been isolated from the universities and have had a staff of three or four to teach their thirty or forty men. Many men have studied theology nowhere but in a theological college. Others have continued in a theological college the study of theology begun at a university, and the history of the Anglican Church contains some significant testimonies to the value of this procedure. There was the testimony of Henry Scott Holland in his book *Creed and Character* (pp. 137-139). There was, thirty years later, the testimony of Charles Gore, included in a memorandum which he submitted to the Archbishops' Committee of Inquiry on the Teaching Office of the Church at the end of the last war.

> I have known very many young men who have gone reluctantly to a theological college, perhaps after struggling to be allowed to be ordained at once or to remain at Oxford, who would in retrospect declare that they "owe their souls" to the theological college. . . . There they have been really converted or set upon the path of thoroughness. There they have learnt the meaning of worship and something at least of the secrets of the spiritual life. And all this depends not merely on the institutions and discipline of the college but on the absence of the former associations of the university, which tend so commonly to indiscipline and spiritual shallowness or dissipation. Intellectually, moreover, at the theological college they have felt for the first time—what is one of the greatest and most illuminating of all intellectual experiences—the coherence in one indiscerptible body of truth of all the "articles" of the Christian faith. Nothing can be a substitute for this intellectual experience.

The whole of this memorandum is worth reading, and its theme will not surprise the reader of the New Testament, for "going apart" had its indispensable place in the training of the apostles.

Now for the criticisms commonly made. (1) One complaint is that the theological teaching is inadequate. The

time has been too short, the staffs have been too small and too hard-worked to maintain their own scholarship. The students have lacked the variety and distinction of teaching that a University Faculty provides. (2) Next, there is the charge of partisanship. The colleges, many of them founded with partisan interests in view, have provided their men with the teaching and atmosphere of one ecclesiastical colour, and have therefore bred a ministry of narrow and limited outlook. (3) Thirdly, there is the charge of pietism. Religion, it is said, is developed in a " hot-house " atmosphere. The spiritual life is cultivated rather artificially without true relation to its broader human setting. (4) Lastly, there is the complaint of parish priests that their deacons have lacked training in practical matters such as the methods of teaching. If little space is given in this article to this last point it is because the other points are nearer to the central problem that is being now debated.

Now what of the criticisms? It is impossible to deny that there is truth in them, and it is unlikely that many will be concerned to deny this. But it would seem the more important that there should be *discrimination* in the making of the criticisms and that the issues implied by them should be carefully diagnosed.

(1) As to the teaching of theology, let it be admitted that the inadequacy of the theological college has sometimes been lamentable. Far too much has been undertaken by too few teachers in too short a time. The need for ordinands to read theology at the university is widely recognized, and may be an axiom of the general lines of future policy. Yet I believe that there is an intellectual function that theological colleges away from the university have been able to perform and will be needed to perform still. The study of theology at the university gives a man knowledge of this subject and that subject; the pieces are separate; the critical often outweighs the constructive; the wood is often missed for the trees; the stage of bewilderment is sometimes not passed; the uniting of the elements of study into one apprehension of one gospel is not reached. Then let the man go to a theological college, and (I describe a process which I have seen happen many times) he finds himself thinking out the meaning of his previous studies in their relation to his coming ministry. The separate pieces are drawn together; he sees the impact of the different subjects upon one another, and instead of bits of knowledge there comes the notion of

a theology unified and made alive by the man's facing the meaning of his vocation. A prolonging of his sojourn in an academic environment may add to his bits of knowledge, but will it lead to the integration of the bits?

So, even where their equipment has been weak, theological colleges have been places of intellectual awakening for many men. But the variety in their equipment is very great, and generalizations about them may be wide of the mark. Where there can be a staff of four instead of three and the regular help of two theologians from a cathedral staff the result may be by no means poor. I have seen the work of "tutors" and "supervisors" highly developed in a theological college, and there are, alas, universities which have still to discover the true meaning and possibilities of this work! Many proposals may be considered—the grouping of several colleges at one centre where each would both live its own life and get the advantage of a larger body of teachers, the greater use of cathedral appointments for theologians who will teach the ordinands, the refusal to recognize new colleges created in a hole-and-corner way. But it seems important that those who plan the reforms should not only condemn colleges and methods that are really bad, but also see what can be learnt from those whose work is well equipped and creative.

(2) What of partisanship? Of course it exists, and perhaps some of the most recently founded colleges are the worst offenders. Yet in the wholesome reaction against partisanship it would be well for us to beware of a training which is "colourless" and not very deep. Both Evangelical and Catholic traditions can be debased into partisan and propagandist things, but they can also be expressed in their richness of thought and charity. Both can lead a man to something deeper than any tradition, the searching out of the soul before God, the realities of sin and pardon and adoration and fellowship. Need we fear distinctiveness of tradition in training? The distinctive tradition may be a way of leading to the depths of things; "colourless" religion may miss the depths. If the different traditions are made one it will be by deep digging into the depths of each rather than by a skimming of the surface of them all. There is danger lest in casting out partisanship we imperil also something that is of real worth. We do not want a clergy who pride themselves on knowing a wide range of spiritual traditions but really know the deep things of none.

(3) Then the charge of pietism and hothouses. Here again the criticism is often just. Where a good theological teaching and a strong common life are lacking pietism can find its noxious growth. Where the worship and devotional training have within them a vigorous theology this growth has no chance. The interrelation of the factors matters supremely; and that is why the notion that men should do all their theology at the university and finish with a kind of devotional and pastoral "top-dressing" at a theological college is alarming. The devotional training must have within it the vigour of intellectual work. The common life of a theological college has sometimes a peculiar vigour. The man at the university meets all sorts and conditions of men, but he can be isolated and pick and choose his own few friends. At the theological college he is in continual touch and clash with others who, though all ordinands, are of the widest variety of temperament and character. The touch and clash are vigorous and unavoidable; and the movement of character is sometimes very big. Pietism *can* creep in, but it is very far from being the whole story.

Such are the chief criticisms and the issues which they raise. If I have said nothing about the development of "practical" training it is because this very important matter is not acutely controversial. Big experiments are now being made in the training of ordinands in the art of teaching, for instance; there is both general agreement as to the necessity for this and also for the early years of the ministry being treated more deliberately as a time for training continuous with that of the pre-ordination period. Controversy centres rather in the problem of the relation between university and theological college; and I would end, not with any set of practical proposals, but with an attempt at a diagnosis. What does the training of a priest involve?

(1) Theology must be learnt. This, for an Anglican, means first and foremost the study of the Bible. This study must be critical and to a certain extent analytical. Treated in a dull textbookish manner the analytical study can and does kill the student's interest; treated by teachers who are theologically alive it can help him to get to grips with the theological themes and human responses that run through the Bible. But, beyond analysis, study must lead on towards the apprehension of the unity of the biblical revelation and towards a biblical-mindedness that can

view our own days from within the biblical drama. Thus the study of the Bible will lead on to the study of doctrine. Happy are they whose course is so planned that the greater part of their biblical work precedes their work in doctrine. For doctrine is not a subject-in-itself to be "learnt up": it is the working out within the Church's thought and experience and worship of the meaning of the biblical revelation. It must be studied with the biblical themes as the continual background. And in the last stage it must be thought over and thought through in relation not to academic questions only, but in relation to the man's approaching ministry of preaching and teaching and prayer. He must be helped to find the unity of his studies—to read the Old Testament with the light of the New Testament upon it, to use both Old and New Testaments in thinking out the meaning of doctrine, to see the impact of both Bible and doctrine upon history and morals and worship, and to discover the impact of them all upon his own life. From first to last this is a big task: and who is sufficient for it? The theological colleges are not, for they cannot grapple effectively with the earlier stages. The universities are not, for they cannot in themselves provide the latter stages. When men get ordained straight from an academic course what is omitted is not merely a stage in their "pious" development, but a stage in the movement of their intellectual life. The problem is not how to add to an academic theology certain pastoral and practical subjects, but how to handle theology itself in a pastoral way and bring it into a pastoral context.

(2) But side by side with theology as knowledge about God there is the knowledge of God Himself and the bringing of the heart and mind and will into touch with Him. This cannot be left to look after itself; a man needs more help than he sometimes gets in discovering the meaning of the demands of his vocation. And of course the growing knowledge of God will include the expansion of a man's grasp of people and things around him in their relation to God. The idea of a spiritual "polishing" added at the end of a "secular" education seems very wide of the mark. For when once a man is aware of his vocation to the ministry he is pledged to see all his studies and interests in relation to it. He will be asked at his ordination, "Are you willing to give yourself wholly to this office, to apply yourself wholly to this one thing, and to draw all your cares and

studies this way?"; and he cannot be ready to face this question unless he has been learning to see and to use the so-called "secular" things in his education and environment with Christian eyes and Christian discrimination. This Christian discrimination will include knowing that God created the world as well as the Church and studying with a Christian mind what the world is doing. It will include the thinking over what renunciations the life of the ministry may demand. It will include the facing of the possible demands of vocation as regards marriage and the handling of money. Therefore pastoral leadership and guidance is needed in the early as well as in the last stages of an ordinand's training. The highest ideal of ministry and consecration must be set before him; and the final result will be something far bigger than pietism if, in relation to his whole education, he has been coming "to know God, or rather to be known of God".

It might not be hard to make plans to secure a more learned clergy, or a more devout clergy, or even a clergy which is both learned and devout. But it will be disappointing if those who are planning for the future see the problem within these categories. For the true problem lies at the point of intersection, and the work of the ministry will be truly done by clergy whose intellectual life is blended with spiritual power and whose spiritual life is the outcome of a vigorous theology.

A. M. Ramsey.

Natural Goodness[1]

It is a little unfortunate that in ordinary English talk the words "natural" and "supernatural" have come to be considered as opposed rather than as complementary. Something like it has happened with those other words "nature" and "grace", but less frequently, since the second two are more often used by trained theologians. But certainly the common use of the first two words implies rather a division between their meanings than a union.

This would be more comprehensible if we meant by

[1] Mr Williams wishes it to be known that this article was not written with specifically theological readers in view; but for our part we are sure that it is entirely in place in Theology.—Ed.

" supernatural " only the world of angels and of God. It is true that God is so wholly " other " that only in the broadest sense can anything we mean by " supernatural " be applied to Him any more than " natural ". But of the two terms we must use one rather than the other. And the forces of the world of angels are certainly different from our own " natural " forces. It is also true that the Christian religion has asserted that those " natural " forces are but elements, and even infinitesimal elements, in the whole range of creation. But they are so far harmonious with it that they appear contrary only because of that element in man which we call sin, and they are not insignificant or negligible. The " supernatural " must therefore in some sense include the " natural." " A new earth " was promised as well as " a new heaven ". Whatever the promise means, that earth is presumably in some relation to this earth.

Matter, certainly, is by definition the opposite of spirit. It is apparently as far the opposite of God (leaving will and morals out of the question) as God chose to create. But it did not therefore become less significant of Him than that less technical opposite which is called spirit. We have, in fact, only lost proper comprehension of matter by an apostasy in spirit. Matter and " nature " have not, in themselves, sinned; what has sinned is spirit, if spirit and matter are to be regarded as divided. That they so easily can be is due perhaps to that lack of intellectual clarity produced by the Fall.

There is, I understand, an opinion permissible to the faithful which may be discussed here. I am told that it is related to the great name of Duns Scotus, and no doubt it is, if permissible, familiar to readers of THEOLOGY. But it is illuminating on this subject and illustrates the problem of natural goodness.

It is, briefly, that the Incarnation is the point of creation, and the divine " reason " for it. It pleased God in His self-willed activity to be incarnate. But obviously this union of Himself with matter in flesh did not necessarily involve the creation of other flesh. It would have been sufficient to Himself to be Himself united with matter, and that " united with " means a union very much beyond our powers to conceive; more than a union, a unity. Even now, in spite of the Athanasian Creed, the single existence of the Incarnate Word is too often almost Gnostically contemplated as an inhabitation of the flesh by the Word.

But it is not so; what He is, He is wholly and absolutely, and even in His death and in the separation of body and soul He remains wholly and absolutely one. His act could have been to Himself alone. He decreed that it should not be; He determined creation; He determined not only to be incarnate, but to be incarnate by means of a mother. He proposed to Himself to be born into a world.

This decree upon Himself was the decree that brought mankind into being. It was His will to make creatures of such a kind that they should share in that particular joy of His existence in flesh. He bade for Himself a mother and all her companions; perhaps the mystery of the mortal maternity of God was greater even than that, but at least it was that. It was the great and single act of active love, consonant with nothing but His nature, compared to which the Redemption (if indeed He were infinitely to maintain all souls alive) was but a sheer act of justice. Our flesh was to hold, to its degree, the secrets of His own.

Nothing has ever altered, nothing could ever alter, that decree. I do not, of course, mean even to seem to separate it from His other acts; only one must speak in terms of time. Certainly He acted altogether, He created and redeemed and judged and executed judgment all at once. But it seems that, as far as we are concerned, He also in that act created process and therefore time, time being in this sense the mere measurement of process. Indeed, so determining to be incarnate by a mother, it might perhaps be said that He determined process for Himself also, and even that, for pure increase of joy, He determined that the process should depend on the free-will of His mother and of men. He designed exchange of joy; He gave us the final privilege of owing everything to ourselves as well as to Him. This moment was our primal nature, and nothing has ever altered that fact—not though we may wish it had.

There followed, as we know, the chosen catastrophe which we call the Fall. Whether in that state in which mankind was, the Fall was a single act of a single soul, or the simultaneous act of all souls, this is not the place to discuss. It is, I suppose, possible (since it is to be believed that every human creature sins) that in some way every human nature sinned at once; that the whole web was at once and everywhere ruined. That is irrelevant to the fact that, however it happened, it certainly happened. The will of man sinned. But the will of man was a spiritual

quality; it was in his soul. It was that power in him which we call the soul that sinned. It was not the power which we call the flesh. It was therefore the "supernatural" which sinned. The "natural", as we now call it, did not. They cannot, of course, be separated. But if, in terminology, they can be, then it is the matter of our substance which has remained faithful, and the immaterial which has not.

The definition of the Fall is that man determined to know good as evil. Whether (as may be) it was indeed an affair of the fruit of a tree or whether that is symbolical does not matter. But if the good, which was whole, was to be known as evil, then process must be known as evil; that is, the process must be to a living death. The end would be hell. But all the qualities and all the glories of that human creation were not in one moment changed to a state of hell. So much the decree of process itself forbade. The end might be inevitable, but it had to be gradual.

His nature, as it were, was still implanted in His creatures; it was, indeed, human for divine, their nature. Nor has that foundation ever failed. They devoted it to everlasting death. But the genius of it, so to speak, was of eternal life. He who had desired His creatures to accept His choice now accepted the terms of His creation; He accepted the choice of His creatures. The Incarnation became also the Redemption. He became the new thing. But that did not prevent Him from being the foundation of the old thing. He was, is, and is to be, the light that lighteneth every man.

The Apostolic and Catholic Faith declared the Redemption of fallen nature, but that Redemption was on the principles and to the principles of our first unfallen nature. Man could not longer be innocent; he was corrupt, and his best efforts were, but for the new grace, doomed to death. But his best efforts were, and are, of no other kind than had been decreed. His blood might be tainted, but the source from which it sprang was still the same. His natural life was still, and is now, a disordered pattern of the only pattern, a confused type of the one original; it is full still of glory and of peace, as well as of bloodshed and despair. It contends within itself. The most extreme goodness may be found in it and asserted of it—so long as the absolute invalidity of it apart from the new life is also declared. The most absolute domination of the new life

may be asserted, so long as the accidental goodness of the old is never denied.

It is no doubt true that the operations of the Christian Church for two thousand years—sacramental, doctrinal, and moral—have had a greater effect than we generally realize. When all allowances, however, have been made for this, and for the various legal and social systems which, touched by Christianity as well as by civic security, have faintly aimed at goodness, it remains true that the goodness in the " natural " order often seems to rival and equal the goodness of the " supernatural ". Something very much like heroic sanctity exists everywhere. This heroic sanctity outside the Christian Church is a thing for which Christians are always " making allowances ". I use the silly phrase because it is the only one that fits. They do not, perhaps, mean it to sound so; the effect is due to the use of a great vocabulary by inadequate voices. It is also due to the unintentionally insincere claims made by foolish Christians on behalf of their Christian experience. Vigil, heroism, martyrdom, vicarious life, are common to man. In so far as they are possible outside the Church, they are elements of man's original nature operative within him in spite of, but under conditions of, the catastrophe of the Fall. In so far as they are impossible inside the Church, they are the change in man's fallen nature which even grace has not yet renewed. Nature and grace are categories of one Identity.

What, then, are we to hold is the value of the Christian religion? It is applicable far beyond itself, in the sense that what it says is the only final validity of those other great acts of goodness. Union with our sacred Lord is obtained by acts. Belief is, no doubt, an act; proper motive is an act; but also an act is an act. The great doctrines are the only explanation and the only hope. But even the great doctrines are only the statement of something as wide as the universe and as deep as the human heart. They do not deny as Creator that which they adore as Saviour, though the Creator had to become a Saviour lest His creation should be wholly lost. It is to be believed that, except by the Cross and Resurrection, no act is valid; and that by that Cross and Resurrection the proper validity of every act is determined. The Christian Church has been charged with the great secrets which are the only facts of existence. But the visible and vocal Church will have to practise much

humility, in itself as well as in its separate members, before it can find itself capable of speaking on equal terms with that nature which it has to regenerate with universal blessing.

The Incarnation of the Son of God led to the Cross because it summed up and prevented the otherwise inevitable end of human process both individual and general. But it is at least a question whether the Incarnation only existed to lead to the Cross or whether it was in fact the original act. The Church is the means of penitence and faith. But the lack of penitence and faith cannot altogether destroy the value of what remains of natural goodness. The transformation of natural goodness into eternal goodness demands all stress on both the Incarnation and the Crucifixion. Our great difficulty is that it is much easier to transform eternal goodness, or what should be eternal goodness, into natural goodness. "When religion is in the hands of the natural man," wrote William Law, "he is always the worse for it; it adds a bad heat to his own dark fire and helps to inflame his four elements of selfishness, envy, pride and wrath." But it was the same William Law who wrote: "Natural religion, if you understand it rightly, is a most excellent thing, it is a right sentiment of heart, it is so much goodness in the heart, it is its sensibility both of its separation from and its relation to God; and therefore it shows itself in nothing but in a penitential sentiment of the weight of its sins, and in an humble recourse by faith to the mercy of God. Call but this the religion of nature and then the more you esteem it, the better; for you cannot wish well to it without bringing it to the Gospel state of perfection. For the religion of the Gospel is this religion of penitence and faith in the mercy of God, brought forth into its full perfection. For the Gospel calls you to nothing but to know and understand and practise a full and real penitence, and to know by faith such heights and depths of the divine mercy towards you, as the religion of nature had only some little uncertain glimmerings of."

Remove the word "God" from that description of natural religion, remove the word "religion", and the principles still hold. Those principles are in our nature because of His, and the Word (and we by the Word) are other than all the vocabularies.

CHARLES WILLIAMS.

Auden's New Leaf

"At last the secret is out, as it always must come in the end" (*The Ascent of F6*, p. 116). Mr Auden has made a statement, and, being Auden, he could only make it in verse.[1] The verse he has chosen is the light trot of Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*, and perhaps only he in this or any other age would have tried to make it do so much, though not without doing violence to its nature. In Part I he defines his intentions.

> All our reflections turn about
> A common meditative norm,
> Retrenchment, Sacrifice, Reform. (9-11.)

But what is most notable in this part is the invocation of his masters. Dante first,

> That lean hard-bitten pioneer
> Who spoiled a temporal career
> And to the supernatural brought
> His passion, senses, will, and thought,
> By Amor Rationalis led
> Through the three kingdoms of the dead. (165-170.)

Then in a far easier, more familiar tone he invokes Blake ("a choleric enthusiast") and Rimbaud ("the adolescent with red hands"). Part II is about the operations of a very real devil, who is treated sympathetically, but humorously, as Satan always is in an orthodox scheme:

> For how could we get on without you
> Who give the savoir-faire to doubt you
> And keep you in your proper place,
> Which is, to push us into grace?

Part III I take to be about the purgative way. This is more difficult and more diffuse. About the next step there is still much bewilderment:

> Since over its ironic rocks
> No route is truly orthodox,
> O once again let us set out
> Our faith well balanced by our doubt,
> Admitting every step we make
> Will certainly be a mistake. (959-964.)

[1] *New Year Letter*. By W. H. Auden. (Faber & Faber.) 7s. 6d.

The certainty lies elsewhere, for the just city which must be built is made " from the muddled heart " (1677) by powers beyond us. The true subject of the poem is grace.

Auden has always been a religious poet. Mr John Lehmann has written (*New Writing in Europe*, pp. 146-7): " He has always been more interested in the general problem of society's illness, and in his idea of ' love ' as history, than in the actual physiognomy of today's battles." " Sir, no man's enemy, forgiving all " was in his first volume. In *Look, Stranger!* he invoked " Love, the interest itself in thoughtless heaven ", in Spain, " History the operator, Time the refreshing river." To him " grace abounding " even where sin abounds is no new discovery of maturity. The clue was there for who would read it in the autobiographical part of *Letters from Iceland*. At Oxford

> All youth's intolerant certainty was mine as
> I faced life in a double-breasted suit.
> I bought and praised, but did not read, Aquinas.
> At *The Criterion's* verdict I was mute.

(We all know the type, a bit of a " spike ".) Christopher Isherwood let out in the Auden number of *New Verse* (November, 1937) that in their first dramatic collaboration the hero was a bishop. Isherwood said in that interesting note, " The Anglicanism has evaporated, leaving only the height ", but he also said, " If Auden had his way, he would turn every play into a cross between grand opera and high mass." He is as much the child of his religious background as Charles Baudelaire. He writes in one of a series of sonnets called *The Quest*, which are printed as an appendix to the *Letter*:

> Could he forget his child's ambition to be old
> And institutions where it learned to wash and lie,
> He'd tell the truth for which he thinks himself too young,
>
> That everywhere on the horizon of his sigh
> Is now, and always, only waiting to be told
> To be his father's house and speak his mother tongue.

His mother tongue he speaks in riddles still. That is a clue to many of the deliberate cryptograms which make this poem unnecessarily difficult. The earlier cryptograms were often inevitable, though there has always been some passion for mystification. But some of these, which are not elucidated in the notes, a mine of strange quotations from

Pascal, Kierkegaard, George Groddeck, Margaret Meade, Kafka, C. S. Lewis, etc., with much original verse and prose (mainly theological) interspersed, seem to me deliberately intended to mask from the uninitiated a direction which might otherwise have been only too obvious. Yet the final invocation communicates before it is understood:

> O Icthus playful in the deep
> Sea-lodges that for ever keep
> Their secret of excitement hidden;
> O sudden Wind that blows unbidden
> Parting the quiet reeds; O Voice
> Within the labyrinth of choice
> Only the passive listener hears;
> O Clock and Keeper of the years;
> O Source of equity and rest,
> *Quando non fuerit, non est.*
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Send strength sufficient for our day,
> And point our knowledge on its way,
> *O da quod jubes, Domine.*

Many people may feel that this tone of tender shyness is far too consistently detached from direct concern with the struggle which a few years ago seemed all-important to Auden in China and Spain. And some of the argument remains on the level of abstract words and is never concentrated by wit and the concrete instance into verse, while on the other hand some of the description, as of the court of the master-poets, has been allowed to outrun the argument. But the tone is remarkably consistent, nor does it avoid a clear and unimpassioned statement of the nature of Nazism:

> The Immanent Imperative
> By which the lost and injured live
> In mechanized societies
> Where natural intuition dies,
> The international result
> Of Industry's Quicunque Vult,
> The hitherto-unconscious creed
> Of little men who half succeed. (1027-34).

Auden is now an American citizen, and, I understand, a soldier in the American army, but never before has he seemed so firmly rooted in an English tradition (" England to me is my own tongue"). He will come back.

George Every, S.S.M.

Some Memories of Baron von Hügel

These memories, slight as they are, may have some interest for those who knew Baron Friedrich von Hügel, as they touch the personal side of that great man.

It was early in March, 1922, that I received a letter from the Baron.

13, Vicarage Gate, W.8.
March 9, 1922.

Evie Lance, that kind mutual friend of ours, has often told me what a trained and skilful secretary you are. My Jewish shorthand and typing damsel has married and lives far away. And I should be glad could I find in yourself one who could help me as much as she did. . . . My mornings must remain exclusively devoted to my composition work, in which I *think* I had better go on, without help, as hitherto. But in the late afternoons and evenings of Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday, I would gladly have you for the dictation (shorthand) of letters, &c, for two hours, any time between 4.30 and 8. Five to seven preferred. If *that* would suit you, I should prefer Mondays, and, next, Tuesdays, for your visit. But Wednesdays or Thursdays I can also quite well manage. I should want the dictated letters back, in type (with their envelopes typed also), if possible on the afternoon of the next day. But afternoon of the day after the next will still do. . . . I have only to add that the next week is all full up, so that the proposed arrangements cannot begin before Monday, *March 20*, at earliest. But I hope you will be able to start with me in that week—the week after next. (I find, by the bye, that I have arranged to see a friend on the Thursday, 23rd, in that week.)

With kind remembrances to you all,
Yours v. sincerely,
F. VON HÜGEL.

I think you would find the proposed work interesting.

I had been prepared for this letter, and the great honour it offered me, by " our kind mutual friend ", Miss Eveline de la Belinaye Lance, whom we had known actually much longer than the Baron had. " E. B. L." was a woman of outstanding character and charm, widely read in English and French literature, and a water-colour artist of great talent. Her literary qualities and her keen incisive wit were very congenial to the von Hügels, and she was a frequent guest at their house. Every summer the Baron spent some weeks at Thursley, in Surrey, in rooms near her

cottage, finding in that peaceful lovely village the rest and relaxation that were impossible in London. Every Monday afternoon, as long as she lived in London, the Baron went to see her, reading or discussing every subject under the sun. A reference to her in the *Letters*, edited by Dr Bernard Holland, expresses something of the affectionate admiration he felt for her.

Whenever my father, Bishop Blyth, of Jerusalem, was in London, the Baron came to see him, and after his death in 1914 the Baron kept up these occasional visits, often bringing the conversation round to him: " What would the good Bishop-father say, or do, in such a case, do you think ?" In later years, as his strength declined, the visits dropped to one, as early in the New Year as possible; but the cards at Christmas never failed.

It was an unforgettable experience to listen to him, as out of the good treasury of a mind stored with learning and a memory trained to carry facts and present them at the appropriate moment he poured forth the riches of his wisdom and his thought. He was good to watch, too, as the fire kindled within him and his dark eyes seemed to burn in his ivory-white face, the torrent of words being accompanied by expressive gestures of the long, beautifully shaped hands. I have heard it said that his discourse was often over people's heads, that he could have spared himself by adapting himself to the capacity of his audience; but I don't think he knew how to " spare " or " adapt " himself in this way, any more than he knew how to set the perfect courtesy of his manner by any social distinctions; he simply had no second-best to give. Whatever was the subject of his work or study at the time generally formed the topic of his conversation; he said that " talking it out " helped to clarify a matter in his mind. Owing to his deafness, he had the habit of talking at length, pursuing his point unerringly through many parentheses, and then, with disconcerting suddenness, he would present his ear-disc to someone and invite comment or question.

When he was writing *The German Soul*, in 1915, he often discussed passages and arguments in it with us, which we recalled afterwards in reading the book. I remember his saying (but that was after the War) that he did not like to see the war memorials in towns and villages all over England. " They recall the War—keep up the war spirit," he said; " a pity !" Nor could he see any other

meaning in them. During these talks about *The German Soul* he said: " The German is earnest and serious-minded, and it is difficult for him to have patience with the English habit of light speech and trifling, which to a German seems unworthy and almost unmanly. I myself find this very difficult to understand sometimes. No matter how important the subject is, the Englishman will always joke about it, treat it lightly as if of no consequence. If one tries to discuss a big matter gravely, the Englishman becomes uncomfortable, and if he cannot laugh the subject aside, or change it, he will leave one as soon as he can do so in courtesy." " If one sees a group of Englishmen talking together with interest and animation, it is sure to be on sport, or occasionally on politics. A similar group of young Germans would be discussing matters of real moment. But in his *conduct* the Englishman is not light; his government of native and backward peoples is an art, and yet without apparent effort. He will saunter into his office, work for no longer than he is obliged, and after lunch he will make time for tennis; he must keep fit ! Yet he does his job to perfection. The young German official will turn up early in the morning, in a stiff collar and ' properly ' clad for work, whatever the climate, and his spare time is spent in studying to perfect himself in his job; but still he is far behind the Englishman in results." " Can you wonder that the young German official resents it when he sees the Englishman, in spite of his ' lightness ', succeed, when he himself, for all his earnest application, has failed ?"

Knowing that we all loved dogs, the Baron always brought Pucky with him. Pucky was a little Pekingese who really belonged to his daughter, Baroness Hildegarde, but had attached himself to him in her absence and lived in his room. Pucky would often forsake his own basket for the sofa, and if the Baron were minded to lie down for a short rest Pucky had either to be cajoled into taking an armchair instead, or, if the little dog proved obdurate (which happened quite often), the Baron would content himself with what space was left, rather than incommode him. The Baron took Pucky for airings and also, unless he knew a dog to be unwelcome, when he went visiting. Dogs not being allowed inside an omnibus, the Baron would tuck Pucky under his arm and climb to the top deck (which in those days was uncovered), and sit there, sheltering the little creature as well as he could. The Baron was devoted

to Pucky, and often said how much he learned from the little creature: " His utter faith in me, his unquestioning obedience—what a fine lesson this little dog can teach me on what should be my own attitude of trust and submission towards God !"

I have wandered a long way from that letter of March 9, 1922, with its gracious offer of work. Fully as I realized the honour of it, I felt myself to be inadequate and unworthy for such a post, chiefly because I knew no other language than my own. I wrote to the Baron, expressing as well as I could my gratitude for his offer and my fears of not being up to his work. He replied:

This, alas, late and P.C. communication is but to say that I gladly accept and thank you very much. I await you at 5 on the 20th. French and German (Italian too) would have been welcome. Yet even English alone will greatly help.—Yrs ever, F. v. H.

The Baron's study was a large, light room to the left of the entrance hall, overlooking the green trees of a quiet square. It was crowded with books in many languages; they filled the bookcases, stood in piles on every table and on most of the chairs, and overflowed upon the floor in heaps. The seeming disorder was no disorder to him; he could generally tell you where a particular book would be found; the difficulty of running to earth a German or Latin volume that was " fourth from the bottom in *that* pile there, by that bookcase ", was due to the darkness of the corner or the height of the pile to be tackled.

I was very nervous that first time, and dreadfully stupid. The Baron dictated about twenty letters of varying length, which were to be typewritten at home and posted to him next day, with their envelopes stamped and addressed, all ready for signature and dispatch. In one or two letters to foreign correspondents I made a horrid mess of names of people and books. The next time I came I inquired anxiously about these, and was told, with infinite kindness, " The letters to A and B—yes, there were some odd mistakes, but my wife copied them quickly and no post was lost. Do not distress yourself; we all make mistakes in new work."

It was arranged that I should go on Mondays from five to seven, as by that time he had got through any afternoon engagements and had had his tea; but very often he was

so deeply immersed in work that he quite forgot his tea, which stood chill and neglected on a tray beside him. He would never allow fresh tea to be called for. "Too bad to give them [the servants] extra trouble. *They* do not forget to bring it at the right time, it is I who forget to drink it." A cup of tepid tea would be disposed of hastily, and the tray pushed aside.

The Baron's daily routine was laid down by himself, and he adhered to it with characteristic precision; a close friend of his later years described it to me: "All his life he has been shut up, not to be disturbed, from coming down at 10.30 or so, till lunch; visible half an hour after lunch while playing games or doing puzzles; shut away for sleep till 4, or 3.30, then out for a walk; visible by appointment between that and 5.30 or 6; sleeping or letters till dinner; visible after dinner for half an hour, then subsiding into the study of picture-books till bedtime. He sometimes breaks through to go for an hour to the 'movies' with his wife. I suppose that without these immovable rules and regulations he would get no work done." This letter brought home to me vividly the inescapable solitariness of a deaf person's life, and also (to use his own expressive term) "the costingness" to the Baron of his work.

At first the Baron dictated all the letters, but later on he would give me notes of what he wanted said, leaving me to cast them into letter-form for his signature. This gave time for other dictation. Sometimes he would dictate his paper for the London Society for the Study of Religion (called by him "the Religion Society"), or a lecture, or he might give me a sheaf of notes to arrange and copy while he worked at something else, or rested. He had a delightful habit, surely peculiar to him, of giving a brief biography of the person to whom he was writing before dictating the letter, which gave a vivid and unique interest to each one. I felt as though I knew his friends too, though they lived in all parts of the world and I did not know in the least what they looked like. He could not write a short letter; he would have saved himself much labour and fatigue if only he could have done so. I think it was partly his exquisite courtesy that made him answer so minutely, point by point, letters, often from complete strangers and about their own concerns, which took toll of his time and strength to an unfair degree. Sometimes a correspondent would object to something the Baron had said or written—or was reported

to have said or written—the very objections raised and the manner in which they were expressed betraying the critic's inability to grasp the Baron's exalted way of thought. No matter: A shall have a fuller, a more complete explanation of that point; he must need help thereon, or why did he write at all? Reasons were given in reply, supported by quotations from this or that authority, which often entailed a long delay while the passage was looked up and quoted *verbatim*. A letter of this kind would fill ten, fifteen, twenty pages of an ordinary shorthand reporter's notebook; each book, when finished, was burnt. Letters to acquaintances began conventionally; letters to friends would begin in all sorts of delightful ways: " My very dear A." " My good kind friend." " My dear brave B-friend."

The Baron had a genius for friendship, and few men had a wider or more varied circle of friends; he heartily admired their achievements, respected their attainments, delighted in their letters and their company. His friends seemed to fall into categories or sections, distinct from, and in some cases unknown to, one another, though in close touch with him. Possibly, the orderly and methodical process of his mind and thought, in which he was so typically German, had something to do with this arrangement, for he was so big in heart and mind that he could make full and satisfying friendships with men and women all over the world, of diametrically opposite views and interests from himself as well as from each other. He would concentrate his whole heart and thought upon the concerns of each one as these came before him, and though a friend might seem to retire into the background afterwards it was only the background of the Baron's busy day, never of his heart or remembrance.

Nothing (I speak of the months I was with him) gave the Baron such unalloyed pleasure and satisfaction as the invitation of the Senate of Edinburgh University to deliver the Gifford Lectures for the sessions of 1924-25 and 1925-26. He decided to work up for these Lectures a book he had already planned on the Reality of God. He had masses of notes for it, and he had also written passages for incorporation in different sections as he came to them. This bulky mass of manuscript, carefully tied together, was kept on a bookcase behind the head of his sofa.

" I feel more at home in Scotland than I do almost anywhere else," he said once, when talking about these lectures. " Partly, no doubt, because my mother was a

Scotswoman and so I am half a Scot. But also there is in the Scottish mind and outlook a general seriousness, a weightiness, which is ready to discuss grave matters in a suitable spirit." Here, and on other occasions when he spoke like this, seeming to have in mind the troubling, incomprehensible English " lightness ", I realized how difficult it must be for foreigners, even the most sympathetic in mind, to understand the English, whose deeply reserved nature takes cover in all sorts of ways, even in the paradoxical habit of " trifling " and frivolous speech. It is this deep reserve of the spirit which makes English and Easterns akin; both peoples will do anything rather than show their heart, and this is why foreigners so often call the English " insincere " and Easterns " subtle ".

I do not think the Baron had any marked sense of humour; I do not remember his ever mentioning any wit, or witty saying, with particular pleasure or appreciation. Fun, good wholesome fun, he enjoyed, but in its place, as a treat or refreshment, the dessert to life's solid meat, rather than as the sunshine that plays over the workroom and lightens its dull corners. He loved Gilbert and Sullivan's operas, and seemed to know them by heart. Browning was his favourite English poet, whose works he constantly gave as presents. When my sister Elinor was married he sent her *The Ring and the Book*, and wrote in it this characteristic note:

This, one of the great books of the world, which shows Browning at the deepest, possesses three or four faults that ought not to blind us to its amazing power and helpfulness. Moving from smaller to more important and obscurer points, these faults appear to be as follows:

(1) Undignified, self-occupied, inappropriately " chattering " passages—*e.g.*, " Ring and Book ", 442-446, 1379-1382; " Book and Ring ", 835, 836.

(2) " One Half Rome ", " The other Half Rome ", " Tertium Quid "—would be more effective if each were a third of their present length, and if they followed each other within a single part.

(3) The latter development of " Pompilia " is disagreeable, as in the mouth of a refined young woman. Some 200 or 300 lines could disappear with great improvement to the whole.

(4) " Giuseppe Caponsacchi " is one of the four gems of the book (itself, the 2 Guidos, and the Pope); but, for a full picture of life, the manysided, a figure is lacking that would present the *joyous* ascetic, the *romance* of a celibacy fully willed as a means and an expression of certain kinds and degrees of renunciation

and helpfulness to others. The Pope, and the Friar (in "the Book and the Ring") are too old to illustrate this fact and grace.

(5) "Guido" is so terribly grand, because it dares to picture an impenitent soul—another of the facts of life so often shirked nowadays. Yet "the Old Yellow Book" describes G. as truly penitent at the last; and Br. himself indicates, here and there, that this was, or may have been, the case. But this undoes the fulness of the impressiveness. Either Br. ought boldly to have departed *throughout* from the actual history of G. on this point, or he ought to have found another complete story, or a figure from another story, for working up into a type and example of perdition.

He would quote Shakespeare, not so often the words, perhaps, as the intention or teaching of a particular passage, scene or character; I used to think he loved to wrest Shakespeare's inner meaning from the words and to make it his own by following and developing it for himself through the processes of his own mind. I remember his referring to Keats with appreciation; unfortunately, I have forgotten the connexion here. Spenser he disliked, considering him "gross" and "coarse", and maintaining that these blemishes prevented him from taking rank amongst the great poets of the world. He was referring to the *Faerie Queene*, and it is easy to understand that the vigorous expression of Spenser's political and religious views in certain passages must have been objectionable to him. Among English novelists, Meredith, Thackeray and Trollope were favourites. Scott, Dickens and George Eliot were in the second rank, though he knew all their books well.

Before he was invited to give the Gifford Lectures the Baron had been closely concerned in a series of lectures which Professor Ernst Troeltsch was to deliver to theological students in London early in 1923. The Baron believed that these lectures, to be delivered before English audiences by a German of such eminence, heralded a day of better understanding between England and Germany, and that much depended on their success; whatever he could do to help forward the scheme he promised to do, and did with all his power. Professor Troeltsch was to stay at Vicarage Gate, and the Baron looked forward immensely to his ten days' visit. The lectures were to be given in German, preceded by a synopsis of each in English. The Baron was arranging for him to lecture also in Oxford and in Edinburgh. And then Troeltsch died very suddenly in

Germany. The news of his short illness and death came as a great shock to the Baron; a fair prospect was shattered, and he mourned for that as well as for his friend. He made up his mind forthwith that this last work of his friend must not be lost; and the lectures, " translated into English by various hands ", were published in June, 1923, by the University of London Press under the title of *Christian Thought : its History and Application.* The Baron translated one lecture with Professor Ernest Barker, and he " carefully revised " all of them, either with Professor Barker or Mr Edwyn Bevan. He also prepared the very full Index, and wrote an Introduction which (he says) " cost me much labour, especially also as an act both of fearless fidelity to my own best lights and of devoted, interpretative love for the man who ought here to eclipse us all ".

His work upon Professor Troeltsch's lectures made vast demands upon the Baron in mind and body; he found himself unable to concentrate upon the Gifford Lectures, in which he was becoming more and more absorbed, and his health proved unequal to the double strain. Two promises were in conflict, and he felt that the one he had given to his dead friend must be kept at any cost. He gave up the Gifford Lectureship. When he told me of his decision (he had mentioned the possibility of this more than once) something of the dismay I felt must have shown itself in my face, for he said, very kindly, as if he were consoling me for a disappointment, " Yes, it is a pity, but there was no other way that I could see." It was an act of heroic self-sacrifice.[1]

As the Baron became more engrossed by work upon all these lectures, my times with him became less regular; he might want me once or twice a week, and then perhaps not for a fortnight. On the occasions when he could not let me know beforehand, he was unnecessarily distressed at the " inconvenience " his " forgetfulness " had caused me, and that in itself was a disturbance to his work, which should have been kept free from all such trivial outside considerations. Eventually it was arranged that I was to take down notes of his letters and dispatch them under my own name as his secretary, and also to take home any work

[1] Though the Gifford Lectureship was given up, the Baron continued to work at his book. It was brought out in 1931 by his literary executor, Dr Edmund G. Gardner.

he wanted typewritten. There were many interruptions, due to his increasing weariness and ill-health. It seemed as if the severe strain he had passed through in the episode of the Troeltsch and Gifford Lectures had sapped his vitality, so that the creative side of his work was often weighed down by the actual labour of it. He spoke sometimes as if he were dissatisfied with what he had written and as though sheer weariness had marred the expression of the high thoughts and convictions that filled his mind; but his patience and diligence never faltered. "I shall take up that bit later on," he would say, "and perhaps do better after a rest."

"E. B. L." told us of his illness, and then of his passing on January 27, 1925.

I will close with a letter from Baroness Hildegarde.

I am sending you one of my Father's mortuary cards, which I think you may like to have and which I hope you will think appropriate—my Father so enjoyed his work with you always. We are in great hopes that his last unfinished book will be able to appear at Christmas—I think you helped him with the first part which was so unfortunately interrupted by Prof. Troeltsch's death, which took him away from his own book for such a long time. We are here in the Thursley he loved so much for a few days.

The card has on one side a photograph of the Baron, sitting in the familiar attitude of thought, his head resting on his hand, with that look of expectancy, or what he himself would have called "awareness", only to be described in the words, "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth!"

Estelle Blyth.

"The nemesis of an anti-theological religion is that it has no resources in a crisis except pale quietism or ruddy patriotism."—P. T. Forsyth, *The Justification of God* (1916), p. 4.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. M. Ramsey is Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham and Canon of Durham Cathedral. He is the author of *The Gospel and the Catholic Church.*

Mr Charles Williams is on the staff of the Oxford University Press and the author of *He came down from Heaven*, etc.

Brother George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission and the author of *Christian Discrimination.*

Miss Blyth was private secretary to the late Baron von Hügel.

The Rev. H. P. Kingdon is Fellow and Chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford, and editor of *The Way.*

The Rev. F. E. P. S. Langton is Vicar of the Church of the Holy Redeemer, Clerkenwell.

REVISED REVIEWS—VIII

Notes on the Parables of Our Lord. By Richard Chenevix Trench. London, 1841.

It is just a hundred years since the first publication of this justly famous book, which reached its tenth edition in 1866 and its fifteenth in 1886. Its author, the future Dean of Westminster and Archbishop of Dublin, was at that time perpetual curate of Curdridge, Hants, a post he resigned in the same year to become Samuel Wilberforce's curate at Alverstoke, before passing on to the chair of Divinity at King's College, London, a few years later. To have produced such a compendium of patristic learning, seasoned by a thorough study of contemporary English and German scholars, at the age of thirty-four is remarkable, especially when one remembers that Trench had only been a priest for six years and a deacon for nine; for he had participated, after achieving some success as a poet at Trinity College, Cambridge, in General Torrijos' ill-fated expedition of Spanish exiles in 1830, before taking Orders in 1832.

The book consists chiefly of a succession of exegetical sermons, one on each parable, which did much to raise the low level into which Anglican preaching had fallen at the beginning of the last century. But it is prefaced by four introductory chapters, the first defining the nature of parables, and distinguishing them clearly from fables, myths, proverbs and allegories: the second vindicating their value as a method of teaching; the third discussing their interpretation, and refuting in particular the attempts of Gnostics and Cathari to twist them to their own uses; and the fourth enumerating with notable learning and absence of unworthy bias some of the parables current among the Jews

(although not those found in Buddhist literature, or, *e.g.*, the *Arabian Nights*). The view put forward by some earlier scholars that these parallels are "wit stolen by the Jews out of the Gospel" is emphatically rejected.

Besides an abundance of apt quotations (in which the Latin of the earlier editions has been replaced by English in the fifteenth) from the Fathers and more recent commentators, such as Bengel, Trench also displays a noteworthy acquaintance with Philo and Josephus. Indeed he seems more vividly conscious of the actual historical and geographical background to our Lord's ministry than many a modern scholar. He is at pains to reject attempts to see in the Parables prophecies of subsequent history and he sometimes anticipates the view of Jülicher (1887) that the Parables are not close to allegory (with its many points which have more meaning in the application than in the actual story), but are straightforward stories with not much more than one main moral. At other times, however, Trench does discuss various allegorical interpretations such as that which sees in the Unjust Steward the Jewish rabbis (even St Paul himself according to Theophilus of Antioch) wisely refraining from enjoining upon their disciples the full rigorism of the Law. He does not, however, accept this, but rightly stresses the immediacy and actuality of the moral "Make to yourselves friends . . ." (which he takes to be offset by the contrary sentiment "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon" four verses later), and frankly admits the great difficulty of the apparent injunction to be dishonest as well as prudent. One wonders what he would have made of Professor Torrey's ingenious suggestion that "Make to yourselves . . ." and "The lord commended . . ." were in the original Aramaic ironical questions—it being absurd to suppose that *mammon* will land you in the heavenly tabernacles, and the intervening phrase "The sons of this world . . ." being a somewhat cynical and yet commonplace gloss.

In many other ways, too, the perusal of this book brings home to one anew the remarkable amount of progress (however tentative some of the new conclusions must remain) that has been made in the understanding of the Gospel material during the past century. The knowledge of the Sinaitic Syriac version would not have helped much except in its omission of the word "unprofitable" before servants (Luke xvii, 10); nor does the unquestioned assumption of the priority of Matthew to Mark matter so very much.

But the determination to believe that every word attributed to our Lord was actually spoken in the exact form and context recorded in the Gospels, even when there are inconsistencies in the various accounts, leads to grave difficulties which are only partly faced. Strauss is roundly rated as "a late caviller" (p. 221)—though this word is changed to "objector" in the

latest editions—for going but slightly farther in the direction of historical scepticism than would commonly be done nowadays; and the future archbishop is at his least convincing when he attempts in blind loyalty to his presuppositions to take the sentences " The last shall be first " and " Many are called, but few chosen " (Matt. xx, 16) in the close connexion with the Labourers in the Vineyard which their contiguity suggests. It is therefore not surprising that the statement in Mark iv, 12, that the parables were *intended* to mystify " them that are without ", is accepted without much hesitation, despite Matthew's alternative version. Here again one wonders what Trench would have said of Professor T. W. Manson's re-explanation of the Marcan version (*The Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 76-78).

But although the book has been put badly out of date by such works as *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, by Dr B. T. D. Smith (who does not even refer to Trench), and—for less scholarly readers—by Hugh Martin's *The Parables of the Gospels and their Meaning for to-day*, it nevertheless contains many jewels for those who have the time and the patience to extract them from the five hundred odd pages of sound, if at times commonplace, moralizing in which they are embedded.

H. P. Kingdon.

SURVEY OF LITURGICAL BOOKS

This survey is six months overdue, but even now a very limited number of books have been received, and of this number none can be strictly classified as liturgical, except the first on the list, and that, sadly, is a memorial volume of reprinted articles and reviews of one of the greatest English liturgiologists.

The Committee of the Alcuin Club are to be most sincerely congratulated on the publication of Alcuin Club Collection XXXV—*Walter Howard Frere, A Collection of his Papers on Liturgical and Historical Subjects* (published for the Alcuin Club by the Oxford University Press, 10s. 6d.).

There are doubtless memorials of Dr Frere at Mirfield and Truro, which commemorate his greatness as Superior of the Community of the Resurrection, and his pastoral care as Bishop of Truro, but this volume is his memorial as a liturgiologist, and there could be no better memorial. Here are gathered together reviews and articles which would otherwise be difficult to come by, and, what is even more important, a bibliography of all his writings.

Dr Frere's championship of the 1928 Prayer Book and his *New History of the Book of Common Prayer* made him known to a very wide public as a writer on liturgical subjects, but his real learning was not so widely known. The reviews written

for learned publications are here reprinted and show his vast knowledge of palæography, early music and medieval manuscripts. There are also articles gathered from the *Truro Diocesan Gazette* which demonstrate his power of applying his great store of knowledge to practical pastoral problems. It is too early to assess Dr Frere's place amongst the great liturgiologists, but when this can be done he will probably receive highest recognition amongst them for his medieval work. This is altogether an admirable volume and a worthy memorial to a man who as scholar, monk, mission preacher and bishop has made countless thousands his debtor.

Next come two volumes of a trilogy on the Celebration of Mass by the Rev. J. O'Connell, *The General Rubrics of the Missal* and the *Rite of Low Mass* (published by Burns Oates, 10s. 6d. each). One had hoped that the third would have appeared in time to survey them together, but apparently that was not to be. These volumes are strictly ceremonial rather than liturgical, but come easily under the heading of this survey. No word of praise for their thoroughness and careful documentation and citation of authorities can be too high. I know no work in English comparable to these two volumes, which appear to be completely authoritative. They will be most useful to the Roman Catholic rubricist and ceremonialist.

Messrs Burns Oates are to be congratulated on their part of the publication in bringing out in these difficult days at so moderate a price books which can have only a specialized circulation.

Worship, by J. O. Dobson (published by the S.C.M. Press, 5s.), is a difficult book to survey. There is so much good in it that one wishes the author had waited longer before writing it, so that his experience might have been wider and riper. The chapters on "The Necessity of Worship" and "The Fulfilment of Worship" are excellent. But, on the debit side, he shows little understanding of the kind of worship which is the regular worship of the majority of Christians. Further, such a statement as this is an over-simplification: "By the sixth century two main liturgical forms were followed in the Western Church—the Gallican, used by the peoples beyond Rome, and the Roman, deriving from the Church of Rome itself. With the growing ascendancy of the See of Rome, its forms of service gradually superseded the Gallican rites" (p. 73). No mention is made of the fusion between the *Hadrianum* and the local French rites which occurred in later centuries and which has left an indelible mark on the Roman Missal.

But to end up as we began, on a note of praise, the chapter on "The Sermon in Worship" is stimulating. The preaching of the Gospel and the declaration of the will of God must have a greater part in public worship, and be given a higher place of honour, than the ministry of the Word has lately enjoyed,

otherwise there will soon be no ministry of the Sacraments, but only a half-understood esoteric cultus.

Saints' Days, as observed by the Churches of the Anglican Communion (published by S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.). The nature of this book is sufficiently explained by its title. It is in some sense a *martyrologium*. The short notes which accompany each name are good and scholarly.

But this book raises the much larger question of canonization in the Anglican Communion. The latest name officially recognized by any of the Anglican churches is that of St Francis of Assisi, who died in 1226. The Feast of the Saints, Martyrs and Doctors of the Church of England proposed in the 1928 Prayer Book, and which is kept in Scotland and South Africa under a slightly different title, allows the individual Christian a liberty of numbering later heroes amongst the Saints, but this is not satisfactory.

I must record with shame that until now I have not read any of the publications of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement; this is a serious fault if all the A.E.G.M.'s publications reach the standard of *The Riches of Our Prayer Book*, by J. P. Hodges (published by S.P.C.K., 2s.). The author has treated the subject in an unusual way and has written a most stimulating and suggestive work which deserves a wide public. He takes phrases from the " Dearly beloved brethren " and shows how these aspects of divine worship are amplified and brought out in the church services. A thoroughly satisfying book.

Guide to the Scottish Prayer Book, by W. Perry (Cambridge University Press, 1s. 6d.). This is a good, cheap, practical explanation of the Scottish Prayer Book for the use of the average person who wants to understand something of the history of the services which he uses for worship. It should supply a real want.

Keep Thou my Soul, the Liturgy in Life and Death, War and Peace, by the Rev. E. C. Messenger (Sands and Co., 5s.). This book can hardly be classified under the heading Liturgical. It consists of reflections on the masses " in time of war ", " for peace ", " for a good death " and " for the dead ". The reflections are on a high spiritual level, but avoid any suspicion of being " high falutin' ". One doubts, however, whether they will be of much use to those who have to spend long hours in shelters or dug-outs, to whom the author specially addressed himself.

F. E. P. S. Langton.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE NATURE AND TASK OF THEOLOGY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I have only recently received the March number of THEOLOGY, containing the second part of Fr Mascall's interesting article on " The Nature and Task of Theology ". I don't know whether you are willing to reopen the controversy about liberalism, but, if so, may I offer some belated comments ?

I recall a discussion some years ago on matters political with a convinced Nazi; to statements which to me at least appeared certainly true he would reply in effect: " If you were one of us, you would see the facts quite differently. You must think 'with the blood'." Einstein's Jewish blood inevitably vitiates his scientific theories; the theories on race problems of a non-Aryan are not worth consideration. Argument becomes impossible.

But is Fr Mascall's argument so very different ? He quotes (p. 135) with approval Fr Charlier as saying: " To live supernaturally in the Church and with all the Church is a necessity for the theologian." Let us consider in that light the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The liberal Catholic of what may be called the Gore tradition considered the biblical evidence (or lack of evidence), the extent of general acceptance of the doctrine in the Church, the history of its development, the evidence as to the existence of pre-Christian ideas which encouraged its growth, and then perhaps concluded that the doctrine was a pious opinion which might be held—but which, after balancing probabilities, he was unwilling to assert as truth. Respect for the beliefs of others, including those of many of the Church's teachers, would, of course, prevent him from describing the belief as mere superstition.

The Catholic who " thinks with the Church " in Fr Mascall's sense no doubt would use the " method of working " and " spirit of its own which are neither those of the philosopher nor those of the historian " (Fr Charlier, quoted by Fr Mascall, p. 135), and no doubt would come to the conclusion that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was part of revealed truth. The same argument could be used of the doctrine of the corporal Assumption of our Blessed Lady, even though it has not been decreed by the Roman Church as an article of faith. Again argument becomes impossible. A Roman Catholic controversialist would use very effectively Fr Mascall's argument; surely the Roman Church is the only body " in which the full sacramental life is lived " (Mascall, p. 137), and therefore on

the argument of Fr Mascall the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and of Papal Infallibility must be accepted. Fr Mascall's criticisms of Romanism as stressing a "juridical rather than a sacramental" fact seem to me beside the point. The stress on the juridical follows from the sacramental; certainly they are not independent.

I wonder whether the sense of inferiority produced in the German people by defeat in 1918 has, through the mechanism of compensation, made popular the astonishing Nazi theory; I wonder whether a certain loss of prestige of Anglicanism in recent years is similarly making popular a theory which is equally irrational.

"A priest would never deny reason; it's bad theology", said G. K. Chesterton's Father Brown. No doubt Fr Mascall would assert his agreement, but I should describe his article as another expression of the disturbing flight from reason so significant of the temper of our times.

Yours faithfully,
S. H. Clarke.

St John's College,
Johannesburg.
July 16, 1941.

THEOLOGY AND MISSIONS

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I have read with interest the article of Dr P. A. Micklem on "Missions and Christology" contained in the May issue of your Review, but was rather disappointed that the approach of Dr Kraemer to the problem of native culture and religion (*The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*) was "sharply contrasted" with that of Henri de Lubac (*Catholicisme: les aspects sociaux du dogme*), whose standpoint is assumed to be the one with which the Anglican missionary is "most in sympathy".

The contrast is perhaps more apparent than real. Dr Kraemer writes:

> Christianity can never fall into a religious, cultural and social vacuum, and therefore must find in its various environments an intellectual emotional and institutional expression that in its psychological and social aspects can reasonably be called an expression and not an impediment or inhibition. (P. 313.)

And again:

> The real problem is not their use (the rich religious and philosophic terminology of the great non-Christian civilizations), for that is a matter of course, but *how* to use them. (P. 326.)

It appears to me that the question is not whether or not elements of native culture should be sympathetically treated and preserved from extinction, but whether or not primitive native cultures need that "Divine act of redemptive eruption" (p. 70) by which they must die in order to live, and in what sense this *new* redemptive principle is to be found in the Incarnation.

Further, is it quite accurate sharply to contrast Dr Kraemer's approach on the philosophic side with that of Anglican theologians (reason and conscience have not been "effaced, however confused and darkened by sin": Canon Quick) for he states that:

> The Christian Faith is indifferent to rational coherence in this philosophic sense, not because it is incoherent or necessarily irrational, but because, as the Divine order of life revealed in Jesus Christ, it has a coherence and rationality of quite a different order, and is therefore, when formulated in terms of a definite philosophy, only *partly* expressed and *for a part* strangled and distorted. (P. 64.)

May I add in conclusion that I regret Dr Micklem's choice of a Roman Catholic authority, when the Anglican Church has produced works of equal scholarship such as Dr D. W. T. Shropshire's *The Church and Primitive Peoples* (1938), the approach of which is very similar to that of Henri de Lubac.

Yours faithfully,

E. A. H. Roberts,
Principal.

Fourah Bay College,
Sierra Leone.
July 1, 1941.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

A careful study of the Provost of Derby's article on "Missions and Christology" and of Mr Blow's comments thereon makes it plain that there are not two possible views of the relation between Christianity and non-Christian religions, but three.

The view attributed to the Jerusalem Conference of 1928, that the Christian and non-Christian religions are to be "not so much contrasted with each other as regarded as sharers in a common witness to the supremacy of the spiritual in human life and society", or that at the very least the non-Christian religions are to be "considered as a præparatio evangelica equivalent to that [of] the Old Testament", is no less contrary to the Bible than it is to Christian tradition; St Paul, in Romans, quite clearly sees mankind as forming not one, or even two, but three groups—namely, the Gentiles who are outside both the

Law and Grace, the Jews who are under the Law but outside Grace, and the Christians who are under Grace. We need not wonder, therefore, that modern Protestantism has reacted to the opposite extreme represented in Dr Kraemer's writings and has assumed " a relation, ' not of continuity, but of discontinuity ' between the truth as it is in Christ and the non-Christian religions ". There is, however, a golden mean, and it is represented by the book of Fr de Lubac from which Dr Micklem quotes. While stressing the uniqueness and finality of Christianity, and the uniqueness, though not the finality, of Judaism, it is nevertheless, like St Paul in Romans i, 19-20 and ii, 1-16, prepared to recognize that there is a real knowledge of God to be found outside the limits of the Church, and, what is more, to provide a better description and critique of it than the non-Christian religions can provide for themselves. There are, indeed, available in English two books by modern Roman Catholic writers which take explicitly into the sphere of missiology the thesis that Fr de Lubac discusses only in general terms. I refer to Otto Karrer's *Religions of Mankind*, especially its chapters on Revelation and Salvation outside the visible Church, and Joseph Maréchal's *Studies in the Psychology of the Mystics*, with its discussion of non-Christian mysticism in general and of the Islamic mystic al Hallâj in particular. Those who are accustomed to look upon Romanism as uniformly negative in its attitude to all that is not of itself will be surprised to see how the principle *Facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam* makes it possible to recognize some of the highest types of mystical experience outside the boundaries of the visible Church. Furthermore, we must surely agree with Dr Micklem that this is substantially the view to which the Anglican Church is committed.

This is, however, only part of a larger question—namely, whether in reaction from liberalism in theology we must necessarily adopt an extreme neo-Calvinist or neo-Lutheran position which is so exclusively concerned with the primacy of the revelation given in Christ as to deny all effective action to the Spirit and the Word outside that sphere. The problem is precisely similar to that of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, with the two schools of " theologists " and " rationalists ", and, if some of us to-day see the Angelic Doctor as the guide who can help to solve it, this is not because of any slavish devotion to the dicta of one particular saint and theologian, but through a conviction that the Fall has not so radically corrupted God's creation as to leave nothing of value in it and that the truth revealed in Christ is capable of explaining and illuminating not only the life of the Christian Church but all the activities of man.

Liberalism as a theological principle is pretty certainly obsolete; but the truth for which, in however exaggerated a form,

it stood—namely, the validity of the human reason—is essential to any balanced and organic view of life. At a time when the intellectual principle, which has been the basis of Western civilization, is explicitly denied by the purely biological view of man which is the basis of the philosophy of Nazism, it would be disastrous if we were to capitulate to a similar irrationalism in the theological sphere. There is no need for Anglicanism to surrender to the successors of Calvin and Luther; in her traditional appeal to the analogy of natural and revealed religion she has precisely the weapons that she needs for her colossal task of not only interpreting the Christian revelation to the modern world but also interpreting the modern world to itself.

Yours faithfully,

E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

P.S.—Since I wrote the above you have kindly allowed me to see Fr Clarke's letter. I have already by anticipation defended myself against the charge of irrationalism, but may I briefly comment on one or two of his points?

1. Political questions are on the natural and not on the supernatural plane; hence they fall within the sphere of reason (which does not, of course, mean that revelation has no light to throw on them). The Nazi, with his claim to "think with the blood", is removing politics from the natural sphere altogether, and is in effect making Nazism a matter of revelation and the German *Volk* a Church. Hence Nazism is a *religion*; and this is the supreme objection to it from a Christian point of view.

2. But, in saying that the prime necessity for the theologian is that he should "live in and with the Church", one is not thereby divorcing theology from reason, as the Nazi does with *his* "theology". On the contrary, in my article I stressed the very close connexion that reason has with revealed theology; for, first of all, natural theology provides the prolegomena for revealed theology, and then in revealed theology itself reason plays a real and very intimate, though strictly subordinate, part. I would indeed say that only from "within the Church" can the revelation be fully plumbed and, as it were, become part of one's self. I might even say with Khomyakov that "to a man living outside the Church neither her scripture nor her tradition nor her works are comprehensible", but I should want to add with him that an unbeliever can at least know the Truth "with an external and imperfect knowledge" (*Essay on the Church*, § 5).

3. In considering the Immaculate Conception, full weight should of course be given to the considerations which, as Fr Clarke points out, the liberal Catholic of the Gore tradition would stress. And similarly for the corporal Assumption.

4. As an Anglican I should not admit that the Roman Church

is the only body in which the full sacramental life is lived. That is, surely, precisely our case against Rome. And, on any theory, the Papacy *is* a juridical or governmental institution, while the episcopate is a sacramental one. A man becomes a Pope by election, but a bishop by consecration. Hence, even on an ultramontane view, separation from the Pope cannot affect one's sacramental life in the Mystical Body as loss of the episcopate must. And in my article I ventured to criticize Fr Charlier for laying an exaggerated emphasis on the theologian's obedience to the *magisterium* of the Holy See in comparison with his vital and sacramental union with the Mystical Body.

I do not think, in short, that my position is really as different from Fr Clarke's as he thinks it is.—E. L. M.

The Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln.
August 6, 1941.

THE BISHOPS' MESSAGE

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

In the recent message from the bishops to the people of Great Britain there occurs the following statement: "We believe that the present crisis in human history exceeds in magnitude and in spiritual import any that has preceded it." This is surely a most remarkable affirmation from such a source. How, it may be asked, is such language to be reconciled with the teaching of Scripture? Dare the Christian compare any other crisis in human history in magnitude or importance with that which the pages of Holy Writ record, let alone assert that it exceeds it? "Now is the judgment of this world (*νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*): now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

Of course, the language of the sentence quoted was a *lapsus calami*; and no doubt it is somewhat mitigated by other statements in the document. But the lapse is significant. Indeed the tone of the manifesto can hardly fail to strike many of those very greatly perplexed as to their Christian duty at the present time as savouring too nearly of *politisches Christenthum*. Only a few phrases need be altered, and we have a screed exactly of the type of those issued in profusion by the pro-Nazi elements in German Protestantism in the ten years before the War. "The intensity of our revolt against the spiritual evil embodied *in Parliamentary Liberalism* is at the same time, consciously or unconsciously, an affirmation of belief in God." "In resisting the menace *of Bolshevism* we bear witness to the truth of His laws." "No words can adequately appraise the splendour of

comradeship, courage and self-sacrifice shown by *those who have put themselves under the leadership of Adolf Hitler.* These qualities are found in non-Christian as in Christian. They are of God wherever found, and declare man's dignity as a child of God."

Let us preserve the integrity, in the fullest sense, of our faith. The incentive to Christian action must be sought not in the iniquities of our enemies, nor even in the good qualities which our efforts to resist them awaken in ourselves, but in the Gospel which concludes all alike under sin. "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard *this*, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

F. L. Cross.

Pusey House, Oxford.
August 1, 1941.

REPRISALS

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,—I am astonished at one sentence in Mr Mortimer's otherwise admirable article. For he says of the deliberate bombing of civilians with the motive of breaking down their "will to resist" (his own words), "if this were indubitably certain I should be bound to agree that, with the whole civilian population in some degree guilty of the war, the widespread death and destruction would be justifiable." I would suggest that any endeavour to break down the "will to resist" was *ipso facto* immoral because such an act would have as its object the destruction of the moral will. What is the difference between this and torturing a victim for the extraction of evidence which it goes against that victim's conscience to divulge? We *must* lock up the criminal and the lunatic in order to protect society; but no Christian may attempt to break his "*will* to resist" (if he thinks it right to resist) even if he must break down his actual resistance. I beg Mr Mortimer to believe that there is a difference between the two acts—one of which concerns the victim's conscience, which he must not be forced to violate. He says truly that "owing to the legacy of hate which such a course of action must leave behind it, its wisdom would be questionable; for if one object is attained, the end of war, yet the other—the establishment of a just and lasting peace—is made more difficult." I venture to go further and suggest that if such a method becomes a general policy in "total" war, the name of Christian will become synonymous with Pacifist.

Ashley Sampson.

St Annes-on-Sea.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE JEWS AND JUDAISM DURING THE GREEK PERIOD: THE BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIANITY. By W. O. E. Oesterley. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

" Christianity was born of Judaism, the study of which is a necessary preliminary to the understanding of much that we read in the New Testament. In many respects Judaism was, under divine providence, a preparation for Christianity. To illustrate this is the main purpose of the present volume." So Dr Oesterley writes in a prefatory note. The book which follows is divided into six parts. Part I—Historical Introduction, containing (i) a general survey of the history of Western Asia from the conquest of Persia to the downfall of the Seleucid kingdom, (ii) the history of the Jews during the last three pre-Christian centuries; Part II—The Sources, containing a brief treatment of the following subjects: the Scriptures, the Law and the Oral Tradition, the Apocalyptists and their literature, the influence of Persian thought and teaching on Jewish ideas; Part III—The Theology of Early Judaism, treated under the headings: monotheistic belief, universalism and particularism, the kingdom of heaven, the Messiah (first phase of belief), the Messiah (the development of belief), the doctrine of sin and retribution, belief in immortality (the Old Testament), belief in immortality (the Apocalyptic literature); Part IV—Worship, in the Temple, in the synagogue, in private; Part V—Teachers, *i.e.* the Scribes, the Wisdom teachers, the Pharisees and Sadducees, the Essenes, the Therapeutæ; Part VI—Belief in supernatural beings, angels, demons. The book ends with a brief retrospective summary, a bibliography and an index.

The prefatory note tells us that " this book is not intended for specialists in the subject; rather it is written for those who may be interested in the somewhat intricate investigation, but who are unable to find the time to study the sources and the various works of authoritative writers, English, American, German and French, who have done so much to further information and knowledge, and to whom the present writer is so much indebted ".

The general readers here contemplated will read with interest what Dr Oesterley has written, and will be grateful for his copious quotations from original documents. They may sometimes feel that they are being invited to accept as evidence of direct borrowing resemblances between two documents which really mean no more than that both are dealing with the same kind of theme (*e.g.*, the Egyptian document quoted on p. 141 resembles the addresses composed at election time by modern parliamentary candidates almost, if not quite, as closely as it resembles Hebrew Messianic prophecy); they may sometimes

feel that Dr Oesterley is extracting from his sources rather more than those sources contain (*e.g.*, from Jer. vi, 16-18—p. 241), and that his summary of a discussion occasionally goes beyond what the discussion has actually proved; but the evidence is before them, and they can form their own conclusions.

Some things, however, they will not know unless they are told: *e.g.*, that the truth of some statements, which seems to Dr Oesterley undeniable, has often, and not without reason, been denied; that the Letter of Aristeas (quoted as the testimony of an eye-witness on pp. 205, 202) is " propaganda " at its most imaginative; that there is a considerable element of " propaganda " in Josephus' picture of the Jewish sects; and that few scholars would be willing to allow any historical value whatever to the accounts of the origin and early history of the Jewish priesthood contained in the Priestly Code (p. 240*ff.*).

F. S. Marsh.

Cambridge.

The Sources for the Life of S. Francis of Assisi. By John R. H. Moorman. With a Foreword by A. G. Little. Manchester University Press. 12s. 6d.

This is a learned book, squarely in the tradition of the British Society of Franciscan Studies, whose founder contributes a foreword, and of the university that publishes it. Mr Moorman's study of Franciscan sources has led to one important suggestion for their reassessment and to some valuable chapters on various points connected with the foundation and early history of the Franciscans.

Among the most important sources for the history of St Francis and his order are the saint's own writings, the two *Lives* of Thomas of Celano, the *Legend of the Three Companions* and the *Legenda Maior* of St Bonaventura. While it has been usual to accept the *First Life* of Celano as prior to the *Legend of the Three Companions*, Mr Moorman accepts the latter as representing the earlier tradition. When in 1244 desire for a new Life of Francis led the chapter general to send out an invitation to the brothers to send in writing " whatever they might truly know of the life, signs and marvels of blessed Francis ", brothers Leo, Angelo, and Rufino, intimate friends of the saint, wrote their reminiscences of him and collected such tales of him as they believed true; it took them two years. They said in their preface that they had written " not in the manner of a legend, seeing that for a long time legends of his life and the miracles which God performed through him had been put together: but rather, as from a fair meadow, they had plucked a few flowers which seemed to them the most beautiful, not following any consecutive story ". The body of the work cannot have been, however,

the original, disconnected collection of stories (p. 96): that most precious of all Franciscan sources, in the form sent in in 1246, has been lost; but it was used by Celano in the *Second Life*, survived in separate rolls, and has been reconstructed by Mr Moorman (p. 98) from fragments embedded in other Franciscan writings.

Mr Moorman prints the "primitive Rule" of 1210 and discusses with understanding the controversies that arose over the writing of the subsequent Rules, with "Francis reluctant to accept the changing conditions, and Ugolino, Elias and Honorius III desperately anxious to direct the spiritual forces which Francis had generated into a channel which would not only be *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*, but also to the advantage of the Catholic Church". He considers that the final Rule of 1223 "cannot be regarded as representative of the real wishes of Francis". In point of detail, important detail, the assertion seems proved.

But by and large, the question whether it was a misfortune that the "real" wishes of Francis were overruled is not so simple. Francis desired that the will of God should be done; he acquiesced in the advice of Ugolino, even against his own judgment, and it is unimaginable that he should have acquiesced for any other reason than that he believed it to be the will of God. As Dom David Knowles has shown, the original aim and character of the Cistercian order changed through the crowds attracted to it by St Bernard; the Cistercians might have remained a very strict, select, small order, as the Carthusian order in fact became. That is not to say, however, that the Cistercians were wrong in modifying their ideal. The Franciscan fraternity, unmodified by counsel, might have remained a devout, semi-lay sect in Tuscany, or the strong hermit tendency in the order might have prevailed; they might have been one of God's secret delights and very little known to man; but who is to say that this was divinely willed, or that Francis in 1223 was not guided in his acquiescence by the Spirit of God?

M. Deanesly.

Cambridge.

Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man. By Thomas Reid. Edited and abridged by A. D. Woozley. Macmillan. 21s.

Thomas Reid was born on April 26, 1710, exactly one year before David Hume. Hume's *Treatise* was published in 1738, when Reid was minister of New Machar. In 1751 Reid was appointed to a chair at Aberdeen, and in 1752 Hume became librarian of the Faculty of Advocates in Edinburgh, where he spent most of the rest of his life. In 1764 Reid succeeded to the chair of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow. Hume died in 1776, Reid in 1796. From about 1750 most of Reid's work was

directed upon the problems provoked in his mind by Hume, and his *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, published in 1785, present what is perhaps the most important part of his results. In 1763 Reid wrote to Hume: " I have learned more from your writings in this kind than from all others put together. Your system appears to me not only coherent in all its parts, but likewise justly deduced from principles commonly received among philosophers."

This catalogue of dates is relevant to an estimate of the importance of Mr Woozley's new edition of Reid's *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, for not only must the work of " Hume's principal contemporary critic " help to an understanding of Hume himself, but also Reid's similarity to Kant marks an important point in the development of British philosophy. In these islands in the eighteenth century Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding* (to which Reid pays a generous tribute in ch. 9 of Essay II) was the standard textbook. Locke was formative for Berkeley, and Berkeley has been called " simply an incomplete Hume ", and Hume aroused not only Kant, but also Reid, who in his turn exerted influence in France and America.

So even if Reid misinterpreted the last section of Book I of the *Treatise*, and other similar passages, and Hume was not the sceptic Reid took him to be, there is no doubt of Reid's permanent importance; and Mr Woozley is to be congratulated on finishing his book " among the far from academic surroundings of barrack-room life ", and his publishers on bringing out so attractively a work of this character at such a time as this.

It must be confessed that Reid starts at a disadvantage. He lacks the attractiveness of Locke and is far removed from the keen brilliance of Hume's prose. But, through his many repetitions, and the dullness of his style, something shines which is missing in them. And if I am not mistaken this is in some way related to his Christian faith, which enables him to say of those who worked before him on the philosophy of mind: " they all have given new light, and cleared the way to those who shall come after them."

Of Reid himself this is true, as Mr Woozley hints in his introduction. " Reid ", he says, " laid the foundations of a type of philosophy . . . which has had a particularly strong influence in our own day, most obviously illustrated by Professor Moore, to some extent even in Bertrand Russell." And just because Reid is tackling the perennial question, What are the immediate objects of the mind's awareness? most of his essays contain something which " gives light " and " clears the way ". His recurrent discussion of the importance for philosophy of an understanding of the nature of words and language and his examination of self-evident propositions and of the first principles of contingent and necessary truths are but two instances of this.

It only remains for me to record that the book is a joy to look

at and to handle, that Mr Woozley's introduction, though brief, is attractive and helpful, and that his notes on Reid's text are very much to the point; in the course of elucidating Reid's obscurities and ambiguities, they contribute many points of detail to our understanding of other philosophers. The index has obviously had time and care spent on it. The book would have been easier to use, though not so pleasing in appearance, if each page heading could have included the number of the essay and the chapter.

H. C. L. Heywood.

Cambridge.

This War and Christian Ethics: A Symposium. Edited by Ashley Sampson. Basil Blackwell. 6s.

The publication of Karl Barth's *Letter to Great Britain from Switzerland* raises with acuteness the question of Christian pacifism. The pike in the carp pond has again ruffled the waters of compromise, for there is uttered the stern "Let him be anathema" against those who will not make support of *this* war the symbol of their faith in the Lord Jesus. The book under review, according to the dust-jacket, shows "that there is a good deal less difference between the Christian pacifist and the Christian non-pacifist than there is between the Christian pacifist and the non-Christian who happens to share his pacifism". You cannot have it both ways. If war support is to be the badge of faithful discipleship in our day, then the pacifist is outside the Ark, along with the rest of the unbelievers, pacifists or not.

But the nearest thing to a unifying principle in this book is the conviction that the question of participation in any war is an example of the working out of the conflict of the "two kingdoms", that the decision on whether in *this* war participation belongs to the obedience of the City of God or to the Kingdom of this world is one for the individual conscience, and, because it is based on an assessment of the relativities of history, has not the excluding force of a decision of faith. This is the line taken by Canon Cockin, writing on the war as the "Judgment of God", by Mr Vidler on the "Theology of Pacifism", by Mr Norman Pittenger when he writes on "Prayer in Wartime", stressing the necessity to bear in prayer the tension of knowing our cause to be only relatively just and consequently the impossibility of praying for our victory *tout court*. The same attitude underlies the New Testament studies of Dr Lofthouse and Mr L. J. Collins, though they naturally stress the absolute distinction between the Kingdom of God and the peace of God from the kingdoms and the peace of this world. Of course, though distinct, they are not irrelevant. Dr Lofthouse comes down heavily on the side of "the prevention of lawless and violent

acts " as an exercise of Christian love in the field of international relationships. Mr Collins is on indefensible territory when, in trying to indicate the positive responsibilities of Christians, he suggests that " to each (political) problem there can be only one solution compatible with the Gospel ". Nothing else he says indicates the criteria of such a confident decision.

There is another group of essays which suggests that the Christian decision in this particular historical moment is against this war. Two of them, Fr Gerald Vann's and Dr Powel Dawley's, give the traditional Thomistic conditions for a permissible war, each phrasing his questions as to whether this war fulfils these conditions in a way that expects the answer " No ". Similarly, Mr Donald Attwater asks a lot of awkward questions which " many people cannot get answered, or, if answered, the answers are found unintelligible or unconvincing ". None of the temperate war-horses in this symposium would satisfy him. The most complete pacifist contribution is by Professor Farmer. Arguing from the distinction between those who in ethics stress the " good " and the " right ", he avers the possibility of a jagged, categorical " no " which may have to be observed by the Christian, not merely on intuition, but as part of his whole understanding of the ways of God's working in the world, and this intractable issue, on which the Remnant are called to stand, he defines for the Church in our day as the refusal to countenance war as it now is.

Two other essays assume the legitimacy of this war within the general context of a Christian theology of the just war and argue the Christian witness on two issues, Mr Montgomery Belgion that of propaganda and censorship, in which he asserts that the principles of both are already admitted within the Catholic Church and also lawful to the State in its own sphere of duties, while Mr Reckitt contributes some clear and courageous thinking on the permissible limits of reprisals. The remaining contribution, that of Mr Amphlett Micklewright on " The Brotherhood of Man ", seems to fall rather outside the theological axioms assumed by the others. It breathes a moral deploring of war as a regrettable lapse of mankind, due to the ignoring of the principle of the fatherhood of God, and gives a list of " ifs ", by fulfilling which mankind can in future avoid such disasters, as though the conflict between " the two kingdoms " were not the stubborn fact which both the Gospels and any but an up-and-up reading of history suggest that it is.

Barth is not, by nature or by grace, a contributor to symposia; but if he had been in this galley it would have served perhaps to stress that the deepest ground of agreement is to see this question as a department of the witness of the Church to the State. The assertion of the crown rights of the Redeemer over against the blasphemous claims of Kaisar Theos—that is the issue. The problem—and here Barth from his beleaguered island may

not fully sympathize with the equivocations in ours—is to know when Cæsar has ceased to fulfil the limited tasks allotted to him by God and to demand idolatry. Most of us here say " Not yet ", but dare we commit ourselves to a position which implies that he never will ?

Oliver Tomkins.

Sheffield.

The Mind of the Maker. By Dorothy L. Sayers. Methuen. 6s.

The purpose of this book is to throw light both on the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity and on the process whereby a work of art (specially of literature) is produced, by drawing an analogy between the two. It has often been a cause of wonder to me that the image of author and book for the relation between God and the world, though popular among the Stoics, has been so little used by the Christians; and, since this image is one that I have often found helpful myself, I have followed Miss Sayers' use of it with intense interest. I know from experience that if one ventures to use analogy a number of very tedious reviewers will rise up and point out that there are differences, as well as similarities, between the things compared—to which the only reply seems to be " Quite !" I hope it will not be thought that I am suffering from this confusion when I mention the one serious dissatisfaction I feel with Miss Sayers' book. It is a dissatisfaction on the practical, or pastoral, side rather than on the theoretical. I think that in an age when idolatry of human genius is one of our most insidious dangers Miss Sayers would have been prudent to stress more continuously than she does the fact that the analogy *is* merely an analogy. I am afraid that some vainglorious writers may be encouraged to forget that they are called " creative " only by a metaphor—that an unbridgeable gulf yawns between the human activity of re-combining elements from a pre-existing world and the Divine activity of first inventing, and then endowing with substantial existence, the elements themselves. All the " creative " artists of the human race cannot so much as summon up the phantasm of a single new primary colour or a single new dimension. It is one thing, having known many men, to " think of " one more man, Mr Pickwick; to " think of " man himself, of time and matter themselves, *de novo*, is an activity simply heterogeneous to any that we can conceive. Nor do artists give their so-called creatures substantial existence. Miss Sayers quotes from M. Berdyaev that " the image of an artist and poet is imprinted more clearly on his works than on his children ". More clearly, perhaps, but less substantially. For his son, like himself, has biological life, thought, freedom, and the hope of everlasting glory, while his work has only a *mimesis* of all these and is, in that deeper sense, wholly *unlike* a man. I must therefore disagree

with Miss Sayers very profoundly when she says that " between the mind of the maker and the Mind of his Maker " there is " a difference, not of category, bu only of quality and degree " (p. 147). On my view there is a greater, far greater, difference between the two than between playing with a doll and suckling a child. But with this, serious disagreement ends. In general I find Miss Sayers' development of her analogy full of illumination both on the theological and on the literary side. I recommend specially to everyone's attention the following passages. (1) The chapter on Free Will and Miracle. Miss Sayers distinguishes " a tale about marvels " from " a tale abruptly modified by marvels ". If our Lord had descended from the cross when challenged to do so, this would have been an " irrelevant miracle ", not " an integral part of the story "; the Resurrection, on the other hand, is part of the plot—it is one of the things the story is *about*. This is very well done; and it will be noticed that it comes directly out of the analogy Miss Sayers is using and could hardly have come in any other way. (2) Chapter VI, on the Incarnation. A writer can put himself as a character into his own book (I think Miss Sayers spoils the parallel by making the book an autobiography—the *Divine Comedy* is a much better example) and say—" This is what my eternal idea looks like in terms of my own creation . . . this is my characterhood in a volume of created characters ". (3) The very badly needed Note A (pp. 116, 117), which states something well known to anyone who has written the humblest story himself but maddeningly misunderstood by nearly all modern criticism. (4) The chapter on Scalene Trinities. This cannot be explained to those who have not read the book, but I believe it to be a really illuminating contribution to literary classification. It may be that the " ghost " in Miss Sayers' human trinity is the least easily classified of the three persons, but the same is true of his Divine Archetype in the real Trinity.

This is the first " little book on religion " I have read for a long time in which every sentence is intelligible and every page advances the argument. I recommend it heartily to theologians and critics. To novelists and poets, if they are already inclined in any degree to idolatry of their own vocation, I recommend it with much more caution. They had better read it fasting.

C. S. Lewis.

Oxford.

Secular Despair and Christian Faith. By Alec R. Vidler. S.C.M. Press. 2s.

This book contains addresses given in a mission in Liverpool University this year. Books of this kind, though small in size, need the careful attention of those who try to think out the ways of presenting the Christian Faith to-day. And this book

in particular raises questions so large that it demands more than a brief notice from a reviewer.

The missioner here begins by reminding his hearers where they stand, as men and women involved in the disintegration of society and culture which has been happening for several centuries. The position is desperate, the theological name for it is " original sin ", and each must recognize his own share in the guilt, and despair of the world before he can return to the living God. But, beyond despair, God acts. " When a man despairs, he moves into the area where a word of salvation from on high, if there is one, will be listened to." We are justified by faith alone, and the Church is for all its failings the place where God confronts men with His judgment and His peace. So far the first two chapters, and the main theological theme. But the justified sinner responds to God by acts of faith, dependence, and decision in relation to his immediate environment; and, to give illustrations of this " response ", chapters follow on Marriage, the University, and Politics. The two former of these chapters are admirable, and the book would be worth getting if only for them. The book ends with a sermon on the Obligation to Decide.

The presentation of Christianity is austere. Little reference is made to the Resurrection or the Holy Spirit. The reader or listener is allowed to see disintegration, death, repentance. Yet there is in these addresses no uncertainty as to the living God, beyond history and in history, making Himself known to those who face the austere realities. My criticism is not of the austerity of the theme, but of the emphasis on " despair " as a necessary stage in the turning of men to God. Is it true that " the gospel of Jesus Christ can be heard as good news only by those whose self-confidence has been shattered by " bad news "? Assuredly the New Testament shows the necessity for all of a shattering of pride and a conviction of sin and failure. But I cannot find in the New Testament any evidence that " despair " or " bad news " is a necessary or normal part of the process. The convert is faced by news that seems almost too good to be true, and his pride and idolatry become as nothing while he looks away from self to God. Sometimes the way is by self-forgetfulness and sometimes it is by self-abhorrence; but even in the case of the latter " despair " need not be present, for the penitent is looking up towards God. Luther speaks of " die getroste Verzweiflung ", not as preliminary to conversion but as occurring within the Christian life, the attitude which sees the abyss but also sees Christ beyond it. Mr Vidler seems rather to say, " Look first at the abyss; despair; and only then can you look to God." I believe that the *onus probandi*, from the Bible and from Christian experience, rests with the upholder of the " despair " thesis.

A. M. Ramsey.

FAMOUS ENGLISH SERMONS : 730-1939. Edited by Ashley Sampson. Nelson. 5s.

The title of this anthology is misleading, for, of the seventeen sermons which it contains, only one—Colet's Sermon before Convocation—can obviously be described as " famous ". Other famous English sermons are Grosseteste's sermon on Papal Abuses, Sibthorpe on Rom. xiii, 5, Sacheverell on Perils among False Brethren, Hoadly on John xviii, 36, Keble on National Apostasy, Hook's " Hear the Church ", Newman on the Parting of Friends; and most of these are in fact included in Canon Macleane's *Famous Sermons by English Preachers* (1911). To these, which are famous primarily as historic occasions, might be added sermons famous in their own right, such as Latimer's Sermon on the Plough, Temple's Catholicity and Individualism, Mozley on War, Liddon's A Father in Christ (or, alternatively, his " Five Minutes after Death "). For Mr Ashley Sampson's compilation, a more appropriate title would be " Sermons by Famous English Preachers "—although three of his contributors could hardly be included in that category; or, perhaps better still, " The Sermon as Literature." For the opening words of his Preface are these: " The sermon has never been given its rightful place in our heritage of English literature. . . ." Donne is a possible exception; but it may be noted that English students read his sermons as " literature," and not as sermons.

The anonymous editor of *Family Lectures* (third edition, 1796), in his Preliminary Discourse, complains that the public are willing to read moral discourses, but show an unaccountable reluctance to read sermons; and this attitude he regards as quite capricious and unreasonable. " What, indeed, are Sermons, but moral discourses, illustrated, and confirmed, by the sanctions of Revealed Religion ?" That innocent expostulation gives us at once the character of the typical eighteenth-century sermon, and we need not regret that it is unrepresented in these pages, although under these circumstances it is rash of Mr Sampson to observe: " each era of preaching is redolent of the age that produces it, and an anthology of English sermons that missed any one of the phases through which English Christianity has passed would do so at its peril." No anthology of the type he has in mind could afford to include nothing of Tillotson, Simeon, or Melvill. But again we need not regret that this is not an anthology of that type.

What Mr Sampson has done, and done very well, is to give us characteristic discourses by such preachers as Latimer, Donne, Taylor, Baxter, Wesley, Butler, Newman, Robertson, Spurgeon, Magee, Scott Holland. In addition, medieval preaching is illustrated by Richard Wimbledon's sermon at Paul's Cross (1388), or a sufficient part of it; and contemporary preaching by Dr Campbell Morgan and Mr C. S. Lewis, better known as the author of *The Problem of Pain*. These are all interesting

choices; an alternative to the last, if one were needed, might be Canon Eric Abbott's sermon on "The Day of the Lord", preached before the University of Cambridge on June 9, 1940, and subsequently printed in the *Guardian* (July 19) and in the *Cambridge Review* (October 11). It is confessedly a little difficult to see what Swift's Project for the Advancement of Religion is doing in this galley, except by way of relief. A more serious point of criticism is that Mr Sampson has omitted to give page references to his sources, for such references are too useful to be lightly dispensed with. Apart from that, we can have nothing but gratitude for this admirable selection; and the publishers are also to be thanked for producing it at such a modest price.

CHARLES SMYTH.

CAMBRIDGE.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN FAITH. By W. Norman Pittenger Round Table Press. $2.00.

THE UPPER ROOM. By R. A. Edwards. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

There could not be two books on one theme much more different in manner. The first is a theological study, dealing, in the manner of a philosopher learned in the recent literature of his subject, with the main dogmas included in the traditional doctrine of the Incarnation. The second proceeds by way of the discursive imagination, held as far as possible to history by the New Testament material, but not hesitating to fill in the gaps and to make the picture live even where evidence of a direct kind is lacking.

Mr Pittenger's purpose is to show the reasonableness and even the necessity of the full Christian faith as to the Person of Christ, both as to the humanity and as to the deity. It is especially interesting that he turns to the second-century development of the Logos doctrine as one of his main clues. Probably his most important contribution to the movement of the theological dialectic lies in his emphasis on the danger that the recent reactions against liberal humanism should result in subtle denials of the full humanity of our Lord. Kenotic theories are, of course, dismissed, but they are apt to reappear in disguised forms, as, for example, when it is suggested (rightly enough, if the safeguards are sufficient) that we cannot read back from our own psychology to that of the God-man. This must not be taken to mean, as Apollinarius suggested long ago, that Jesus had not wholly and in every sense a human mind. Our caution arises from lack of first-hand evidence, and not from any belief that so separates Jesus from us as to destroy any possibility of His mediatorial work.

The great difficulty is on the other side. It is a problem of making any distinction between the act of God in Jesus and the

act of God in the whole created order. If the deity of Jesus is "God acting in and through Him", so that that act of God is just Jesus Himself "in the totality of His impact upon men", then two conclusions follow. We must recognize that God "acts more significantly at some points than at others", therewith denying, at any rate in its extreme form, Barth's doctrine of the Divine *incognito*, and we must give cosmic significance to the Incarnation itself, as was done by St Paul almost from the first. Here the Logos doctrine becomes centrally significant.

Mr Edwards sets the scene of his book in the Upper Room, and tries to fill out the background of memories and emotions which give significance to the Last Supper and to the associated incidents and sayings. In so doing he goes over almost the whole of the Gospel narratives, and some of the traditional Old Testament material as well, since, as he rightly points out, these memories and prophecies must have been vivid indeed in the minds of Peter and John and the rest. He uses throughout a very free translation of his own, and this is often illuminating, and always fresh. He draws, as he himself admits, a good deal upon historical imagination, and though this certainly makes his pictures live the reader has constantly to bridle himself in, remembering that we know nothing whatever about the life and thoughts of Chuza and his wife, Joanna, or the character of Salome's dance (the narrative certainly does not suggest that she took the head of John and danced with it, but something quite different), or the feelings of the "man bearing a pitcher of water". To say this is only to repeat a criticism which Mr Edwards makes of his own work, and when it is made that work still remains convincing and satisfying in its main outline and purpose.

It has been interesting to be asked to read and to review these two books together because a certain very striking community of method underlies their great divergence in manner. They agree entirely in their method of reading back to a knowledge of Jesus Himself. As Mr Pittenger says, "in any case all of our knowledge of Jesus is, so to say, *mediate* knowledge. It comes to us in terms of *what He meant* to His followers—at first His disciples, and, later, the Church of very early days." Mr Edwards, though he keeps to the Upper Room throughout, works in this witness of the early Church very cleverly, by a kind of proleptic reading of the Epistles and Acts. It is, of course, fundamentally a part of his method, since the Gospels, which he uses with such refreshing simplicity as to their plain historical truth, are a product of days long subsequent to that first establishing of the sacramental fellowship in the little company of the friends of Jesus. Our knowledge is much more than the residual fact of a certain type of criticism. It might much more truly be termed total fact, fact to which indeed not only the life of the early Church, but our renewed experience in the Church and

in the world to-day is for ever adding. Both books alike bear witness to this, and with this renew an emphasis which is greatly needed upon the fulness of our Lord's humanity. The swing of theological thought had been tending to its other extreme. These books are a welcome sign that the pendulum is returning again.

L. W. GRENSTED.

OXFORD.

THE HISTORY OF RIDLEY HALL, CAMBRIDGE (Vol I, to the End of 1907). By F. W. B. Bullock. With a Foreword by the Rt Rev. A. W. T. Perowne. Copies from the Principal of Ridley Hall. 18s.

This impressive volume is the work of one who is a genuine student of history, with an insatiable desire to investigate the past. It will be found of value, not only to Old Ridleans, but to all who wish to know something of the English Church in the nineteenth century and the early years of that which followed it. The primary interest is, it need hardly be said, for members of the Hall, and, in particular, for the older generations. But their successors of a later day may well read it with interest and profit; for many of the men who were trained under Moule and Drury are by this time well-known figures in the Church and in the Evangelical Party.

Dr Bullock has taken a wide sweep, for not only does he go back to the beginnings of the Evangelical Movement in Cambridge, but he also gives an account of the provisions for theological study and preparation for Holy Orders (meagre enough, it has to be confessed) which existed before 1875. The Introduction which deals with these matters is in many ways the best part of the volume.

The main body of the work is concerned with the history of the Hall under the first two principals, Handley Moule and T. W. Drury, each of whom was later to become a bishop. The work of Moule naturally fills the greater space; his influence as first principal was formative, and the length of his tenure, nearly twenty years, was much more considerable. But Drury, although his term of office was little more than eight years, left his mark upon Ridley; he tightened up discipline and caused greater attention to be paid to theological learning. This had, of course, not been neglected by Moule, himself a first-rate scholar; but he was continually regretting his inability to persuade his men that study was their primary duty during their time at Ridley, that it was not to be subordinated even to "direct religious work and devotional exercises". In this connexion it is interesting to notice the tremendous emphasis which was laid by the founders, as well as by successive principals,

upon the need for arduous study. They recognized the weakness of the Evangelical Party and tried to cope with it; but not with any real measure of success, for it still remains. It is a remarkable fact, for example, that no member of Ridley Hall gained the Cambridge D.D. until 1912, when A. J. Tait, then principal, proceeded to that degree.

The volume reaches a very high standard of accuracy, but there are a few errors and misprints. The most serious of them, so far as I have been able to observe, is on p. 434, where a Fellowship of the Royal Horticultural (!) Society is bestowed upon D. J. Davies. One criticism I would venture to make. Dr Bullock has many of the gifts of the historian; in one he seems to be lacking—the ability to discern what is truly relevant. By judicious pruning the volume might have been considerably reduced in size without any diminution of its usefulness. No one, for instance, would deny the important part played by the Rev. E. H. Carr in the foundation of the Hall; but it was surely unnecessary, after having stated that he " came of a very ancient family " (p. 73), to devote more than a page to genealogical details in support of the statement. Again, the casual mention of the works of a certain eighteenth-century Archdeacon leads to a digression in which they are described (pp. 241 *ff.*). Such a description has, it seems to me, as little to do with the history of Ridley Hall as Ammonius Marcellinus's elaborate explanation of the generation of pearls (XXIII. vi. 85 *ff.*) with Julian's disastrous campaign in Mesopotamia. This is, however, but a slight blemish in a work which is a definite achievement. Upon it Dr Bullock is to be congratulated, as is the Council of the Hall for having invited him to compile it.

L. E. Elliott-Binns.

Newton St Cyres.

SHORTER NOTICES

Songs of Spiritual Conquest. By Anna Bunston De Bary. W. H. Smith and Son, Bournemouth. 2s. 6d.

This is a varied collection of poems in respect both of material and of merit. The writer of the foreword commends them as showing " how a Greek joy in the wholeness of things may blend with a Hebrew hope of a new creation born out of suffering and service ". One or two of the shorter ones, such as " The Schoolmistress ", furnish necessary reminders for our times, and all men of goodwill would say Amen to Mrs De Bary's " War-time Prayer ":

" Let not Europe's bitter throes
Bring forth a still-born child."

CREATIVE SUFFERING. By Julia de Beausobre. DANTE AND THE PRESENT WAR. By Lucy Redpath. Dacre Papers 4 and 5. Dacre Press. 6d. each.

These two ably written booklets both deal with the problem of evil in relation to the present chaos. They present respectively the Russian and redemptive and the Latin and purgatorial views of suffering.

M. H.

THE GHOST OF MR BROWN. By Ashley Sampson. Fortune Press. 6s.

This is a ghost story, told by the ghost; a tale of a spiritual existence which, first for good and then for evil, is attracted by a mortal girl, and eventually destroys her human lover. The subject is thus one of those old dreams of evil—the incubus and the slayer; and Mr Sampson presents clearly the high moral lesson of his fiction. I am not quite sure that he has overcome the technical difficulty of providing for the tangibility of the ghost; the *Malleus Maleficarum* had various explanations of it. And I should have liked a good deal more about the "malignant spirits" who seem to affect the ghost. Indeed, my own chief criticism would be that Mr Sampson's book turns in detail too much towards beauty. But pity and terror have suggested the theme, and the end is the hint of expiation.

CHARLES WILLIAMS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: E. B. Castle, *The Undivided Mind* (1s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. S. Whale, *Christian Doctrine* (7s. 6d.).

CHRISTOPHERS: K. and S. Lake, *Family* 13 (*The Ferrar Group*). *The Text according to Mark* (15s.).

C.L.A.: *An Introduction to Christian Social Doctrine* (2s.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: G. H. C. Macgregor, *The Relevance of the Impossible* (2s.).

S.P.C.K.: R. H. Andrews, *Peace for All Time* (2s. 6d.); L. W. Grensted, *Jesus and Our Need*, (1s. 6d.).

The price of *Putting our House in Order*, reviewed in the September number, should have been 3s. 6d., *not* 4s. 6d.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher